

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

Two of the parables, beyond all the rest, create difficulty in our day. The one is the parable of the Unjust Steward. The other is the parable of the Unjust Judge.

The difficulty of the parable of the Unjust Steward is ethical. It is a question of right conduct. The lord of the steward commended his skill in getting out of a tight corner, though it was by adding iniquity to iniquity. And that is intelligible, if the lord was an easy-going man of the world, with a sense of humour.

But our Lord recommends his behaviour for imitation. That is a different matter. The steward made friends for himself by an unrighteous use of the money at his disposal. See, says our Lord, that you make friends also, who when the extremity arrives will harbour you, and see that you use that same unrighteous mammon for the making of them.

Thus the moral of the parable stands. Or seems to stand. Thus it is read by the vast multitudes of its readers. The difficulty is very plain, and few are they that get over it.

But serious as the difficulty of the parable of the Unjust Steward is, more serious is the difficulty

of the parable of the Unjust Judge. For it is a religious difficulty.

The shameless conduct of a callous, indolent, indulgent Eastern official towards an oppressed and helpless widow is held up as illustrative of the way in which God deals with those who come to Him in prayer. It is a lesson in importunity. The translators of the Revised Version entitle it the parable of the Importunate Widow. As this unjust judge had to be pestered by the widow till he was afraid of being beaten black and blue—to use his own vulgar expression—so we are to batter at the ear of God until He is compelled to do us the justice that we desire.

Was there ever daring teacher who dared to teach like this? How utterly does it put to flight the whole array of modern exegetes who bid us be content with the teaching and example of Jesus. If we are content with the teaching and example of Jesus, we are face to face, in these two parables, with teaching that is subversive of the most modest morality and the most elementary religion. And there is no getting over it in that way. Every device that the ingenious expositor hits upon leaves the difficulty in both parables just where it was.

For 'unto you is given the mystery of the kingdom of God; but unto them that are without, all



things are done in parables : that seeing they may see, and not perceive ; and hearing they may hear, and not understand ; lest haply they should turn again, and it should be forgiven them' (Mk 4<sup>11</sup>). First you, then the mystery of the Kingdom. First the follower of Christ, caught by Himself into fellowship and following, and then the seeing that sees and the hearing that understands. First the knowledge of God in the face of Jesus Christ, and then the absurdity of supposing that God avenges His own elect after the manner of the unjust judge.

'And shall not God avenge his elect, which cry to him day and night, and he is longsuffering over them? I say unto you, that he will avenge them speedily.' Yes, speedily ; for He is avenging them all the time. 'Before they call, I will answer ; and while they are yet speaking, I will hear'—that is God. It is they that did not know. The answer did not come as they looked for it, and they thought no answer came at all.

They looked very likely for material things, and He gave them spiritual. 'Master, speak to my brother, that he divide the inheritance with me.' 'Man, who made me a judge or a divider over you?' And then, 'Take heed, and beware of covetousness.'

Christ's own importunate widow (we may surmise that she was a widow) came to Him out of the Syrophenician country. What are you to make of His way with her? The example of Jesus here is as difficult as His teaching there. If you have not Jesus first you can make nothing of it, twist and turn it as you will. But, knowing Jesus, you know that He answered her speedily ; you know that He was answering her all the time. Before she called He had answered ; while she was yet speaking He had heard.

If we had but faith. It is so difficult to believe that we are being avenged, while the enemy and oppressor is upon us. It is so difficult to believe

that the prayer is heard while the wire is on its way from the War Office. 'Nevertheless, when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?' (Lk 18<sup>8</sup>). Not, assuredly, if the faith He looks for is faith in some word of His—faith in His teaching, faith in His example. But if it is faith in Him?

In Archdeacon FIRMINGER'S *Commentary on Colossians and Philemon*, noticed among the Literature of the month, there is an added Note on 'The Alphabet of the Universe.'

It is some phrase, as an American citizen would say. And not only in itself but also as a translation. The Greek is τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου. The Authorized Version has 'the rudiments of the world' with 'elements' in the margin. The Revised Version is the same, both text and margin. What right has Dr. FIRMINGER to translate it 'the alphabet of the universe'?

That is the meaning of the word in classical Greek. It is the word for the letters of the alphabet. 'Have you learned your letters yet?' A Greek visitor would ask: 'Have you learned your *stoicheia*?' And to translate that 'rudiments,' is to suggest the Latin primer, a distinctly later stage in the child's painful experience. And as for 'elements'—that signifies that the child has already become a philosopher.

Perhaps it was because St. Paul speaks of philosophy in this very verse that the word 'elements' occurred to its first translators. The verse is, 'Take heed lest there shall be any one that maketh spoil of you through his philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the elements of the world (AVm.), and not after Christ' (Col 2<sup>8</sup>). And no doubt the ancient sophist had a way of using phrases like 'the elements of the world' to recommend his philosophy and hide his empty pretence. But it is St.



Paul that uses the phrase here. What does he mean by it?

Archdeacon FIRMINGER leads us towards the meaning by steps. First he gives us Lightfoot's interpretation. Lightfoot looked at the phrase as it occurs in the Epistle to the Galatians, and thought, 'with a few of the fathers,' that it meant 'elementary teaching.' But, says Dr. FIRMINGER, 'if "elementary teaching" had been the Apostle's meaning, we should have expected to find as the genitive of object some such word as "principles," "teaching" or "instruction," but this is what we do not find.' St. Paul speaks of the alphabet of the world, not of the alphabet of education.

The next step is to the great majority of the Fathers—a long step and a backward one. To the Fathers the *stoicheia* were the stars, the stars as marking the seasons. And what St. Paul condemned was the custom of observing festivals and new moons and Sabbaths. But Lightfoot very properly says: 'It seems to be much more in accordance with the prevailing tone of Alexandrian theology than with the language and teaching of St. Paul.'

The third step is to Professor Peake. Professor Peake believes that St. Paul is speaking of personal beings—the very same indeed as elsewhere he calls 'principalities and powers,' and 'the rulers of this darkness.' And to that interpretation Dr. FIRMINGER is not a little attracted. 'For the tendency of the time was to think of the Eternal God as remote from the life of the universe and thus to find a place for the activities of legions of created spirits who were supposed to inhabit and control the forces of nature in general and the heavenly bodies in particular. So in the Book of Jubilees (ii. 2) we read of "Angels (of the spirit) of fire," "Angels of the spirit of the winds," of the snow, cold, heat, etc., and of the winter, spring, summer, and autumn. In the Book of Enoch we meet with these "leaders of the heads of thousands who are placed over the whole crea-

tion and over the stars," and are under the direction of the Angel Uriel, who entrusts Enoch with the secrets of the heavenly bodies in order that he may hand down a true tradition as to the right observance of what in the fragments of a Zadokite work are spoken of as

"The hidden things

His holy sabbaths and His glorious festivals,  
His righteous testimonies and His true ways,  
And the desires of His will."

But Dr. FIRMINGER cannot accept it. For the 'weak and beggarly elements,' as St. Paul (in our translation) called the *stoicheia* in Gal 4<sup>9</sup>, are the days and months and seasons and years themselves, not the heavenly hosts which have the control of them. What St. Paul warns his hearers against is a superstition with which we have been made very familiar through the recent study of religion. They had been accustomed to the observance of lucky days. Their whole calendar was a succession of days that were lucky or unlucky. They may have associated these days with gods or spirits, but for the greater number there was nothing in it but a superstitious and degrading belief in one day as more or less propitious than another.

Were the early Christians liable to return to this superstition, and are the Christians of to-day beyond it? Says Archdeacon FIRMINGER: 'It is only fair to observe that Christians, when they neglect the essentials of the life in Christ, often become victims to crude superstitions about lucky days, numbers, etc. A woman, who had not made her Communion for years, once told the present writer that she could not undergo an operation the doctors had prescribed as urgent, since "it would never do to be operated on in Advent."'

The miracles which have the most precarious hold at present are the Virgin Birth and the Ascension. They are both in the Creed, and it is



because they are in it that the recitation of the Creed is contested.

---

Now, it is not their incredibility that gives them a precarious existence. It is the poverty of the Scripture testimony on their behalf. In particular, no account of the Virgin Birth or of the Ascension is found in St. John.

---

Leave the Virgin Birth alone. Come to the Ascension. Why does St. John give no account of it? There are two reasons.

---

The first reason is that he has already made the Ascension inevitable. He has told of the Word that came into the world. He has said that the Angels of God ascend and descend on the Son of man—an improbable honour if He Himself is not to ascend. He has stated explicitly that 'no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven.'

---

The other reason is that the value of the Ascension is to those who see. No description of it, no statement of the fact of it, would be of any use to one who did not see and believe.

---

During the days which fell between the Resurrection and the Ascension, Jesus appeared only to His believing disciples. Physically He could have appeared to others. He could have appeared to Pilate and to Caiaphas, as we are told He ought to have done. But physically *and* spiritually He would appear to none but those whom He had chosen. For they alone could see and believe. To appear physically only was not to secure belief. It never is. 'If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded if one rise from the dead.' It is to make unbelief at once more confirmed and more criminal.

---

Now, in St. John's day, in the day when the Fourth Gospel was written, the difficulties of the Ascension had been thoroughly discussed. To

add to the discussion one more statement of the fact was useless. The statement was already there, in the Synoptic Gospels and the Acts, which were in all men's hands. If the readers of the Fourth Gospel did not believe that Jesus came down from heaven they would not be moved by a statement of fact that He returned to heaven. As it was with Jesus and Caiaphas, so was it with John and the Jews—the physical demonstration was nothing. One thing only was of any value. 'What and if ye shall *see* the Son of man ascend up where he was before? It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing.'

---

Now turn to the *Romance of Eternal Life* (Dent; 5s. net). It is a book written by Mr. Charles GARDNER, the same who wrote that singular revelation of the genius of William Blake, called *Vision and Vesture*. In the new book will be found all that has just been said about the Ascension.

---

No part of the Bible, Old Testament or New, is more perplexing to the modern mind than the early chapters of the Book of Acts.

---

They open abruptly with the supreme perplexity of the Day of Pentecost. They proceed to the performance of miracles—miracles of judgment, swift and unmerciful, as the death of Ananias and Sapphira; or of resurrection from the dead, so isolated and unexplained as that of Dorcas. They tell us of spiritual forces like prayer and praise shaking a material building. They assert the bestowal of Spiritual Gifts, gifts of the most extraordinary kind, and not on select individuals but on the whole multitude of the disciples.

---

Nor is that all. They claim that all those phenomena are due to the direct action of that same Jesus who had just been crucified. And (most incomprehensible of all) they assume throughout that everything takes place in the presence of supra-mundane beings, some of whom



are friendly and helpful, while others are implacably hostile.

---

It is all so real every time we read the record ; it is all so unreal the moment we return to our modern life. What are we to do with it ?

---

We can ignore it for a time. But we cannot ignore it all the time. Still less can we set our modern life up against it and reject as fictitious all that is out of order with our own religious experience. There is a third way. It has been chosen by a Cambridge scholar, at one time Chaplain of Clare College, now Vicar of Ham in Surrey, the Rev. J. R. PRIDIE, M.A. Mr. PRIDIE's book is entitled *The Spiritual Gifts* (Scott ; 5s. net).

---

Mr. PRIDIE accepts the early chapters of Acts as historical. For, let it be distinctly understood, they have (apart from their contents) as good right to be called historical as any narrative in history. And, accepting the chapters as historical, he proceeds to consider their contents.

---

Now, when he turns to consider carefully their contents, the first thing that claims his attention is the fact that throughout these early chapters of Acts the Church is not the Church as the modern mind conceives it. The fundamental idea of the Church there, as in all the New Testament, 'is that of a corporate life lived in definite conscious relation to God and in definite conscious relations of mutual brotherhood among its members. It is an organism rather than an organization, and as an organism the law of its being is the expression of that Divine life with which it is endowed and by which it lives.'

---

Those are the very first sentences of Mr. PRIDIE's book. They carry the whole book behind them. They open the way to the understanding of the strange phenomena which are found in those strange early chapters of the Acts of the Apostles.

For if the Church is an organism, a corporate life, the carrier of the power which proceeds from the risen Redeemer, two things become intelligible. First, the victory of the Risen Redeemer must be made good on earth where the Church has its visible sphere of activity ; and, secondly, it must be made good in those heavenly places where the principalities and powers are. In Mr. PRIDIE's words, 'the living Church of the living Christ has a double function to perform. She has to carry on Christ's work of setting free the souls and bodies of men on earth, and by so doing she has to act as the organ of revelation to supra-mundane beings.' In the Epistles (for that which is taken for granted in the Acts is explicitly declared in the Epistles) nothing is more clear or remarkable than 'the consciousness of the "Supernatural," which is continually making itself felt. On the one hand, the Christ fulfilling Himself through the Church : "As the body is one and hath many members, so also is Christ" (1 Cor. xii. 12) ; on the other, part of that "fulfilling" is the making known *through the Church* "to the principalities and powers in the heavenly places" (i.e. making known to the spiritual sphere in which there are evil powers as well as good) "the manifold wisdom and the eternal purpose of God in Christ Jesus."

---

Now when the Church turned to consider her fitness for this double task she found herself appropriately equipped. First of all she discovered that the necessary *power* had been given her—not the authority only, but the power. And next, she discovered that she had been endowed with special spiritual gifts. These gifts included such 'natural' endowments as teaching and exhorting ; but they also included such 'supernatural' endowments as exorcism and the working of miracles.

---

Those Spiritual Gifts (of which a full and detailed list is found for the first time in the Epistles of St. Paul) were given in order that the Church might perform her double task of antagonizing the spiritual hosts of wickedness above, and of persuading men to embrace Jesus Christ below. But



no clear line is drawn between the natural gifts and the supernatural. It is not even that they merge at their margin. The most supernatural gift, to our way of thinking, is close to the most natural. They serve their purpose, each gift according to its opportunity; but that purpose is not at one time natural and at another supernatural. Every act of the Christ-possessed Church is at once natural and supernatural because every act is directed to a devil-ridden humanity.

---

For 'the world-rulers of this darkness' do not come into the light of common day. Their hosts are invisible to mortal eyes. The fight they put up is usually through human beings. The Church of Christ has to meet 'the wiles of the devil' in men and women. Some of these men and women are manifestly 'possessed'—the nearest approach to a fair fight that the heavenly hosts will offer. The greater number are simply sinners. They are alarmingly active or provokingly passive. And it is through their opposition or inertia that the hosts of wickedness maintain the struggle.

---

Now it is undeniable that the belief in spiritual personalities other than the one living and true God is extremely difficult for the modern mind. Mr. PRIDIE knows it. His own mind is modern enough to feel it. The difficulty takes two forms.

---

One form is religious. It is 'the deep-seated idea that in the process of mental and moral evolution we have reached a stage which warrants us (if indeed it does not insist) in discarding primitive beliefs as definitely belonging only to the earlier stages of man's development and definitely to be discarded by more enlightened folk. At one end of the scale are the affirmations of animism, at the other the negations of such systems of belief as Christian Science.' To this Mr. PRIDIE answers shortly that 'the persistence in one form or another of the belief in spirits would seem to challenge the validity of this idea as a sound canon of progress.'

The other form in which the difficulty presses is theological. It is difficult for Western theology 'to realize any kind of limitation to Divine power, or to make room in our thought for any other personalities besides the Deity and ourselves. It is due to this attitude that any discussion of our subject has for long been ruled out of court. Science has been called in to supplement by her doctrine of natural laws the defects of theological discussion.' 'But,' Mr. PRIDIE replies, 'the newer philosophy of vitalism has shown that natural laws are not the whole account of the matter—that there is a *causa causans* which has still to be taken into account, and this has directed our thought towards new ideas of personal and spiritual elements in the development of human nature. And, theologically, there has been a welcome movement towards re-examining our conceptions of the attributes of Deity in the light of the broader *παντοκράτωρ* of the Nicene Creed rather than of the narrower and less adequate Omnipotens of the Western Creeds.'

---

These answers are short, but they are probably sufficient. For science no longer says that this is impossible and that incredible. Brought up sharply against the claims of the New Psychology, the scientific observer has abandoned the materialistic assurance of an earlier generation. He is as ready now as any theologian to say that all things are possible to him that believeth. Mr. PRIDIE's answers are at least sufficient to send one to the records themselves.

---

And when we return to the records themselves we find that there is one fact of most unmistakable import. It is the fact of spiritual power. Ignore that fact and all the phenomena are isolated and unintelligible. Accept it and they fall into place.

---

For it is not a natural fact. The power which is so evident is not an intellectual or an emotional power. It does not come from the sub-consciousness of the men who have it. It comes from



without. It comes from above. They themselves said so. We see that it is so. They said that it was due to the direct influence of the risen Lord Jesus Christ. We see that no other explanation accounts for it.

And when we see that the tremendous spiritual force which the early disciples possessed, a force which could manifest itself in sensibly shaking a building in which they were engaged together in prayer—when we understand that that force was the very living Lord Himself doing His work in and through His Body the Church, and doing it as certainly as when He went about doing good on earth—then we are able to realize the simplicity and inevitableness of their conviction that the warfare which they were sent to wage was not against flesh and blood, but against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in heavenly places.

For that is the only warfare in which the Lord Jesus Christ ever engages. On earth He never fought with men—not even with the Pharisees, for all the denunciation with which He denounced them. The Pharisees were to be found in Jerusalem as elsewhere, and He included them when He said that He would fain have gathered her children together as a hen gathereth her brood under her wings. It was with the hosts of wickedness that His conflict was, and with them alone. At every turn in His ministry He was brought face to face with them. When He sent the Seventy through the villages of Judea He gave

them power to cast out demons, and He received them back with their proud surprise that even the devils had been subject to them through His name. And at that moment He summed up the aim of His whole life's service in the victory over Satan: 'I saw Satan as lightning fallen from heaven.'

If Jesus was working in the Church now He was working, as ever, to destroy the kingdom of Satan. The Church was there—there of His appointment—to see the prophecy of Satan's fall fulfilled. The earliest disciples undoubtedly recognized the bestowal of the Spiritual Gifts as equipment for a conflict that was spiritual. And when they went forth to exercise them they did not think of themselves as men pitted against other men; they thought of the Spirit of Christ within them arrayed against the spiritual forces of wickedness which used men only as their tools or victims. The lame man who lay at the Beautiful Gate was there by the power of the Evil One. As a man they as men could do nothing for him. But as the victim of Satan the Spirit of Christ could through them deliver him. Were Ananias and Sapphira struck down suddenly to be carried out dead? It was not Peter's word or act that did it. Ananias and Sapphira lied against the Holy Ghost. 'Peter simply revealed'—we quote Mr. PRIDIE here—'Peter simply revealed the enormity of the sin, and physical death came upon Ananias because he had himself killed that principle of spiritual life which would have been able to resist the onslaught of the King of Terrors.'

## The Papyri and the New Testament.<sup>1</sup>

BY PROFESSOR EDWARD S. FORSTER, M.A., THE UNIVERSITY OF SHEFFIELD.

THERE can be little doubt that the rapid spread of Christianity in the first centuries of its existence

was greatly helped by the presence of a universal language throughout the Eastern Mediterranean area.

<sup>1</sup> This paper, which makes no claim to originality, but aims at indicating the way in which recent papyrological research has thrown light upon the New Testament, was read before a meeting of the Bible Studies Society at the University of Sheffield in November 1921.

The use of Greek as the official language of a large tract of the civilized world was due in the first place to the conquests of Alexander the Great. Alexander—though the story of his Hellenic de-



scent was largely mythical—was a firm believer in Greek culture and civilization. Conquered Greece led the conquering Macedonian captive, and wherever Alexander carried his victorious arms, Greek became the common language spoken by a host of various peoples. After Alexander's death the capitals of his successes, such as Alexandria, Pergamos, and Antioch, became centres of Greek culture and art. Greece had lost her independence, but her influence was spread over a vastly wider field; and when Rome in her turn conquered the Nearer East, she found the Greek language firmly established as a means of intercommunication between peoples of many diverse races, and ready as ever to embrace in her system of government any means which seemed to serve her purpose, she adopted Greek as the official language of the eastern half of her empire.

This Common Dialect (*κοινή διαλεκτός*) of Greek is represented by a large mass of surviving literature in both prose and verse. Such prose authors of the Hellenistic and Græco-Roman periods as Polybius, Diodorus, Siculus, Strabo, Plutarch, and Lucian may be taken as the representatives of literary *κοινή*. When, however, we turn from these authors to the Greek New Testament, we find something totally different. There are, it is true, occasional similarities of vocabulary and construction, and certain passages, such as the introductions to the Gospel according to St. Luke and to the Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, certainly remind one of contemporary literary writing. But on the whole, until quite recently, the Greek of the New Testament could only be regarded as something *sui generis*, differing not only from such writings as those of Polybius and Plutarch, but also from the Greek writings of the Jewish authors Philo Judæus and Josephus.

The problem of the nature of New Testament Greek first came into prominence in the seventeenth century. One party, the Purists, insisted on finding parallels with classical Greek, a method which could give no solution. Their opponents, the Hebraists, who long held the field, sought an explanation in the influence of the Semitic languages on Biblical Greek. The truth is that there did not exist until quite recently the requisite evidence for deciding the problem. As lately as 1889 Edwin Hatch, in his *Essay on Biblical Greek*, described Biblical Greek as 'a language which

stands by itself.' Others went further and described it as 'the language of the Holy Ghost,' the inspired vehicle of Divine revelation. Such views are untenable at the present day, for we have in recent years acquired new evidence which has shown us with absolute certainty the nature of New Testament Greek. This evidence we owe to the Papyri.

At the present day practically the only source from which Greek manuscript material in Greek can be obtained is Egypt. Libraries and monasteries have by this time been thoroughly overhauled and their contents examined. But the burial-grounds and rubbish-heaps of the old Egyptian towns have during the past thirty years yielded up enormous masses of papyri, vegetable paper, which the dryness of the Egyptian climate has preserved from the decaying hand of time. Some of these papyri were used as wrappings for mummies, but by far the greater number were found—where they had been thrown aside—in rubbish-heaps over which the dry desert sand has collected. Their decipherment has given rise to a new science of papyrology, in which the lead has been taken by the two Oxford scholars, Professors Grenfell and Hunt. Classical literature has been enriched by the discovery of a new treatise of Aristotle, the poems of Bacchylides, the mimes of Herondas, portions of plays by Menander, and large new fragments of Sophocles and Euripides. But by far the greater bulk of the papyri consists of private letters, official reports, wills, accounts, and other trivial survivals of the rubbish-heaps of antiquity—the sort of papers which are now thrown away when done with into the wastepaper-basket. They were of no value to those who threw them away, but to us they are beyond all price.

The debt of students of the Greek New Testament to the papyri is twofold: firstly, they have enabled us to determine exactly the nature of New Testament Greek; and, secondly, they have thrown a flood of light upon the historical environment in which Christianity grew up.

Firstly, then, as to the light which the papyri have thrown on the language of the New Testament. It is a subject upon which there is still a vast amount of work to be done; but the outlines have already been made clear, thanks chiefly to the labours of Adolf Deissmann in Germany and the late James Hope Moulton of Manchester. The study of the papyri has made it clear that the Greek of the New Testament, like that of so many



of the papyri, is non-literary. It is the vernacular, the ordinary spoken language as distinguished from the more artificial written language of literature. Most of us are conscious that in ordinary conversation and familiar letters we use a language somewhat different from that which we write when we are consciously composing; in the latter case our vocabulary is more carefully selected, the construction of our sentences is more elaborate, and we aim at a certain rhythm and balance. The New Testament, then, is written in the ordinary colloquial language of the day which 'he who runs may read'; and that is why it differs from the contemporary works of literature which have come down to us. And after all, this is exactly what might have been expected. It was to the poor and humble that Christianity made its first appeal, and its preachers would naturally use the language with which they and their hearers were familiar. Indeed, it seems probable that the opposition of the Roman authorities to Christianity was based in part on the fact that in its earliest stages it made its appeal to the lower classes, and tended to create a solidarity among them which might grow into a political menace.

The Greek of the New Testament, then, is the ordinary spoken language of the day. It is not on the one hand a language specially inspired, or on the other hand a type of Greek which has almost lost all its original semblance under the influence of Hebrew and Aramaic. This popular character of New Testament Greek had apparently been insisted on by only one scholar before the discovery of the papyri, namely, the late Bishop Lightfoot,<sup>1</sup> who, lecturing as long ago as 1863, said: 'If we could only discover letters that ordinary people wrote to each other, without any thought of being literary, we should have the greatest possible help for the understanding of the New Testament generally.' In the papyri we now possess this material in abundance, and it has proved the truth of Bishop Lightfoot's words.

It is of course impossible that a universally spoken language such as vernacular Hellenistic Greek should not vary slightly in different places. We know how even in our own country not only does pronunciation vary from one district to another, but to a less extent actually different words and phrases are employed. This is still more likely to happen when the speakers are not

using their native language. In the papyri we find Romans, Egyptians, Jews, Persians, and Arabs all using Greek as a means of intercommunication. The native language of those who use two languages, as did the Christians of the first century, must necessarily influence the official Greek language, which was their second tongue. We find this occurring to a certain degree in Wales and Ireland in the present day. So, too, in New Testament Greek we should expect to find the influence of Hebrew and Aramaic, and indeed traces of them are clearly to be found, but to nothing like the extent which scholars formerly imagined who sought to explain every difference between the language of the New Testament and contemporary literary Greek as due to Semitic influence.

To illustrate this point, a few examples may be given of words or expressions which we formerly regarded as typical Hebraisms, and have been shown by the papyri to be nothing of the sort. The very common and quite un-Attic use of *ῥωτάω* to mean 'request' as well as to 'ask a question' was always regarded as due to unconscious translation of the Hebrew. Its occurrence in the former sense in the papyri shows that it was commonly so used by persons who could not possibly have come under Semitic influence. We may set side by side Lk 11<sup>37</sup>, *ῥωτᾷ αὐτὸν Φαρισαῖος ὅπως ἀριστήσῃ παρ' αὐτοῦ*, 'A Pharisee invited him to take meat at his house'; and a papyrus from Oxyrhynchus,<sup>2</sup> which reads: *ῥωτᾷ σε Ἡραῖς δεῖν πηῖσαι εἰς γάμους τέκνων αὐτῆς*, 'Herais asks you to dinner on the occasion of her children's marriage.'

Similarly the use of *ὄνομα* ('a name'), to mean 'a person' (e.g. in Ac 1<sup>15</sup>, *ἦν τε ὄχλος ὀνομάτων . . . ὡς ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι*, 'and the number of persons was about a hundred and twenty'), was always regarded as due to translation from the Hebrew; but it is also found in this sense in the papyri, for example, in a Berlin papyrus<sup>3</sup> which has *ἐκάστῳ ὀνόματι παραγενομένῳ* ('to each person present').

Even the very common interjection *ἰδοὺ* ('lo! behold'), which has always been regarded as a typical Hebraism, occurs in papyri where no Semitic influence can be suspected. A letter of

<sup>2</sup> O.P. i. 111.

<sup>3</sup> B.G.U. 113, 11, quoted by Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, p. 196.

<sup>1</sup> Quoted by G. Milligan, *Greek Papyri*, p. xx.



an illiterate character now at Berlin<sup>1</sup> reads: ἡ μήτηρ σου ἀσθενεῖ, εἰδοῦ, δέκα τρεῖς μῆνες ('your mother has been ill, lo! thirteen months').

One might quote many similar instances to show that a large number of supposed Hebraisms have been proved by the papyri to be the ordinary uses of vernacular Hellenistic Greek. There remain, however, a certain number of cases which can only be explained as Hebraisms, and must be accepted as such. For instance, such phrases as οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος, 'the children of the bride-chamber' (Mk 2<sup>19</sup>) (that is, the attendants on the bridegroom), are directly translated from the Hebrew to express ideas which are un-Greek. Again, the very common καὶ ἐγένετο ('and it came to pass'), followed by another verb in the indicative, is certainly an example of *parataxis* due to Semitic influence. In the same way, to take a modern parallel, a well-educated Hindu with a thorough knowledge of English might betray himself in a letter by a few constructions or turns of expression due to the influence of his native tongue.

The papyri throw a flood of light on the meanings and uses of countless words and phrases which occur in the New Testament. A few examples must suffice:—

In Lk 2<sup>49</sup> occurs the sentence οὐκ ᾔδειτε ὅτι ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου δεῖ εἶναί με, translated by the A.V., 'Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?' The phrase ἐν τοῖς or εἰς τὰ, followed by a genitive, occurs frequently in the papyri<sup>2</sup> in the sense of 'in' or 'to the house of'; and the R.V. is certainly right in rendering 'in my Father's house.'

The use of the word παρουσία for the 'Second Advent' gains additional force when we find it applied almost as a technical term to approaching visits of the Ptolemies,<sup>3</sup> kings of Egypt, and to the coming of Roman Emperors on a progress to towns in the province.

Again, the use of the verb ἀπέχω, e.g. in Lk 6<sup>24</sup> ('Woe unto you rich,' ὅτι ἀπέχετε τὴν παράκλησιν ὑμῶν, 'because ye have received your reward'), gains a new significance from the fact that the corresponding substantive ἀποχή is the regular word in the papyri for a 'receipt.'

In Ro 15<sup>28</sup> we find the curious phrase σφραγ-

ισάμενος αὐτοῖς τὸν καρπὸν τοῦτον, 'having sealed unto them this fruit.' Its meaning becomes quite clear when we find in the papyri that it was a common practice to seal up sacks of grain, etc., to guarantee the correctness of their contents. For example, a papyrus from the Fayoum<sup>4</sup> reads: σφραγίσον τὸ σιτάριον καὶ τὴν κριθήν ('seal the wheat and barley'). Similarly the papyri show that the verb λικμάω, which usually means 'to winnow,' is quite rightly rendered by the A.V. in Lk 20<sup>18</sup>, 'grind to powder,' a sense not paralleled until the discovery of a complaint made in a fragment of a speech<sup>5</sup> that certain persons had trespassed in a garden and 'crushed the vegetables to pieces' (ἐλίκμησάν μου τὸ λάχανον).

These few examples must suffice to indicate the flood of light which the papyri have thrown on single words and phrases in the New Testament. It is impossible to read a single papyrus without finding some affinities of this kind with the Greek of the New Testament.<sup>6</sup>

So much for *language*, next as to *style*. Any one who reads the papyri in bulk cannot fail to be struck by the similarity of the style of many of them to that of the New Testament. But style is a thing which is easier to feel than to describe. There is, however, one striking feature which is common to styles of the New Testament and the papyri, namely, *parataxis*. It is characteristic of Attic Greek that the period is built up of an elaborate system of contrasted phrases and dependent clauses, all the sentences being connected by particles appropriate to every shade of meaning, and the whole welded together into an artistic whole which makes classical Greek unique among languages. When we turn to the New Testament we find quite a different state of affairs; the sentences have very few subordinate clauses, and, if connected at all, are coupled by 'but' or 'and.' To take an example at hazard from the Fourth Gospel, chap. 8: 'Jesus went up into the Mount of Olives; and early in the morning he came again into the temple, and all the people came unto

<sup>4</sup> B.G.U. 249, 11, quoted by Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, p. 238.

<sup>5</sup> B.G.U. 146, 5, quoted by Deissmann, *op. cit.* p. 226.

<sup>6</sup> Opening at random a volume of the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* I find a short papyrus (O.P. ii. 285), which illustrates from different points in N.T. Greek: (1) the legal t.t. πράκτωρ (Lk 2<sup>38</sup>), (2) the use of διασεῖω (Lk 3<sup>14</sup>), (3) the form ἡμην for ἦν (Mt 25<sup>36</sup>), and (4) the very common use of ἐάν for ἄν with the relative.

<sup>1</sup> B.G.U. 948, quoted by J. H. Moulton, *Greek of the New Testament*, i. p. 11.

<sup>2</sup> E.g. Pap. Teb. 12 and 27.

<sup>3</sup> Par. Pap. 26, 18.



him; and he taught them; and they brought unto him a woman taken in adultery,' etc. This is simple *parataxis*, the sentences being set side by side without any attempt at literary art. A well-known German critic,<sup>1</sup> writing in 1907 of the Fourth Gospel, says: 'The style such as we have here is really not Greek; it is Semitic thinking which is here displayed.' It is quite true that in Hebrew the style is often paratactical, but so also is the style of countless papyri written by persons who cannot possibly have come under Semitic influence. For example, in a papyrus from the Fayoum now at Berlin,<sup>2</sup> a mother writes to her son: 'Late in the day I went to Serapion, the veteran (?), and asked about your health and that of your children; and he told me that you had a bad foot owing to a stake, and I was troubled because you were so incapacitated; and I said to Serapion that I would go with him to you, and he said,' etc. This is written in exactly the same paratactical style as the Fourth Gospel. In fact, both are examples of the same simple style of popular narrative.

So much for the light thrown by the papyri on the language and style of the New Testament. It has only been possible to give a few instances; enough, however, I hope, to make it clear that the language of the papyri and the New Testament is the same, both being written in the ordinary vernacular of the day. Hence instead of regarding the New Testament as the work of writers who, though they *used* Greek, *thought* in Hebrew or Aramaic, we may now, thanks to the papyri, look upon the New Testament as the greatest existing monument of popular-spoken Greek, and on this account alone unique among the books which have survived from antiquity.

The second great contribution which the papyri have made to the study of the New Testament is the light which they have thrown on its historical environment. They bring vividly before our eyes the everyday life of a people contemporary with and living under the same political and economic conditions as those among whom Christianity was first preached. The records upon which history is usually based deal in the main with the doings of great and famous men, who are after all in a small

minority. Thanks to the papyri we know more of the everyday life of the lower classes under Roman dominion in the first century A.D. than we do of, say, the same class in England in the twelfth or thirteenth century. In the first place, the papyri have provided us with a mass of what may be called illustrative documents; and, secondly, they enable us to re-create the general atmosphere of the fifteenth century A.D.

The first point may best be demonstrated by a few examples of passages in the New Testament which can be illustrated by the papyri. In Lk 2<sup>1ff.</sup> we read: 'And it came to pass in those days that there went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus that all the world should be enrolled, and all went to be enrolled, and Joseph also went up from Galilee out of the city of Nazareth into Judæa, to the city of David, to be enrolled,' etc. Among the papyri in the British Museum<sup>3</sup> is one which admirably illustrates the accuracy of the evangelist: 'Gaius Vibius Maximus, Prefect of Egypt (orders): The enrolment by households being at hand, it is necessary to notify all who are for any reason whatsoever living outside their own districts to return to their family hearths, that they may accomplish the customary business of enrolment,' etc. Until this papyrus was discovered there was no satisfactory explanation of the necessity of Joseph's visit to Bethlehem to be enrolled. Furthermore we possess actual census returns,<sup>4</sup> which contain a statement of the place of residence, then a list of the family, slaves, and tenants, with a description of each, followed by an oath that the return is accurate.

In Mt 5<sup>31</sup>, we read the words: 'It hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a bill of divorcement.' Among the papyri we find many such documents. They contain the names and descriptions of the two parties who 'agree that the mutual agreement which joined them in accordance with the contract of marriage shall be dissolved, and that neither will make any claim upon the other, and the wife acknowledge to have received back her dowry.'<sup>5</sup>

In Ac 19<sup>19</sup>, where the effect of Paul's preaching at Ephesus is described, we read: 'Many also of those which used curious arts brought their books together and burned them before all men.' We possess among the papyri actual magical docu-

<sup>1</sup> E. von Dobschütz, quoted by Deissmann (*Light from the Ancient East*, p. 128).

<sup>2</sup> B.G.U. 380.

<sup>3</sup> *Brit. Mus. Pap.* 904.

<sup>4</sup> E.g. *Oxyrr. Pap.* ii. 255.

<sup>5</sup> B.G.U. 975.



ments of this kind, many of them of considerable length. They contain a curious medley of Eastern and Western religious formulæ, showing in what a fluid state were the religious conceptions of the lower classes among whom Christianity was first preached. Deissmann<sup>1</sup> quotes in this connexion the Great Magical Papyrus in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris, where (lines 2998 ff.), after mentioning Ares, Athena, and Hermes, the text gives a charm for those possessed with demons: 'Take oil from unripe olives, together with the plant *mastigia*, and lotus-pith, and boil it with marjoram (very colourless), saying Joel, Ossarthiomi, Emori' (here follows a string of similar meaningless Semitic names), 'and say, "Come out of him,"' etc.

Mk 15<sup>15</sup> reads: 'And so Pilate, willing to content the people, released Barabbas unto them, and delivered Jesus, when he had scourged him, to be crucified.' This is admirably illustrated by a similar proceeding by the governor of Egypt, which is described in a papyrus at Florence.<sup>2</sup> The verdict there is: 'Thou hadst been worthy of scourging . . . but I will give thee unto the people.'

These are a few examples of the way in which the papyri can be used to illustrate actual texts in the New Testament, but the whole atmosphere reminds one of the Gospels. We learn all about the petty interests, the hopes and fears, the family affections and quarrels of a class of people about whom history has nothing to tell us. We find just such incidents of everyday life as occur in the homely illustrations of the Gospel parables—the Labourer in the Vineyard, the Wedding-Feast, the Unjust Steward, the Prodigal Son. We have, in short, the same historical environment vividly portrayed by a mass of documents each of which gives some little detail, but of which the cumulative effect can only be obtained by reading the papyri in bulk.

The letter of a prodigal son,<sup>3</sup> which so admirably illustrates the parable, has been frequently quoted. The danger of travel, of which we are told in the Parable of the Good Samaritan, may be illustrated by a Fayoum papyrus,<sup>4</sup> which reads:

<sup>1</sup> *Light from the Ancient East*, p. 255.

<sup>2</sup> Pap. Flor. 61. 59 ff., quoted by Deissmann, *op. cit.* p. 266.

<sup>3</sup> B.G.U. 846.

<sup>4</sup> *Fayoum Towns and their Papyri*, No. 108.

'Yesterday, the nineteenth of the present month Thoth, as we were returning about daybreak from the village of Theadelphia, in the district of Themistes, certain malefactors came upon us between Polydeucia and Theadelphia, and bound us and also the tower-guard, and assaulted us with many blows, and wounded Pasion, and took away one pig from us, and carried off Pasion's garment.' Incidentally this papyri is, as Deissmann has pointed out, an admirable example of simple paratactical style common to the papyri and the New Testament.

One might quote countless letters which help us to picture the life of the lower classes in the first century A.D., but two more must suffice. The first is the well-known letter of consolation found at Oxyrhynchus,<sup>5</sup> which reads: 'Irene to Taonnophris and Philo, good comfort. I was as grieved and wept over the blessed one as I wept for Didymas' (apparently her own child), 'and I did whatsoever things were fitting, I and all my family. . . . But nevertheless against such things one can do nothing. Therefore comfort one another. Farewell.' The attitude taken by the writer of this letter inevitably recalls 1 Th 4<sup>13ff.</sup>: 'But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not even as others which have no hope'—a chapter which, after stating the Christian hope of a future life, concludes with the very words used in the papyrus, 'Wherefore comfort ye one another with these words.'

My last example is a letter from a father to his student son: 'Cornelius to his dearest son Hierax, greeting. All of us at home send affectionate greetings to you and all those that are with you. Have nothing to do with the man about whom you are always writing to me, until with good luck I come to you with Vestinus and the asses. For if the gods will, I will come to you after the month of Mecheir, since at present I have pressing work in hand. Take care not to offend any man in the house, but devote yourself to your books entirely, pursuing your studies, and you will have benefit from them. Order through Onnophras the white garments which can be worn with your purple cloaks; the others you will wear with your brown cloaks. I will send you by Anoubas money and rations and the other pair of scarlet shoes (?). You gave us great pleasure by sending the fish; I

<sup>5</sup> *Oxyr. Pap.* i. 115.



will pay you back through Anoubas. . . . Tell me about anything you want. Farewell, my son.'<sup>1</sup>

We are apt to think of those who lived nearly two thousand years ago as beings quite different from ourselves. But these letters seem to show that, in spite of material progress, human nature in all essentials has changed very little. The 'daily round, the common task' were much the same then as they are to-day. Such is the interest of the papyri to the student of the human spirit; to the student of Christianity they are invaluable as enabling him to call up a vivid picture of the everyday life of countless men and women who were contemporary with and lived under the same conditions, both political and economic, as the earliest Christians.

<sup>1</sup> *Oxyr. Pap.* iii. 531.

In conclusion, the service rendered by the papyri to the student of the New Testament is twofold. Firstly, from the point of view of language, they have shown us the exact nature of New Testament Greek by proving that it is the ordinary spoken language of the day and have enabled us to put the New Testament in its proper place as the greatest existing monument of popular *κοινή*. Secondly, they give us documents illustrative of countless passages in the New Testament, and have enabled us to recapture the historical environment of primitive Christianity. It is thus no small debt—and it is likely to be increased in the future—which we owe to the rubbish-heaps of Egypt and to the patience and skill of those who have deciphered and interpreted their contents.

## Literature.

### A NEW LEXICON.

MESSRS. T. & T. CLARK have just published *A Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament*, by Professor G. Abbott-Smith, D.D., D.C.L. (2rs.).

No book is more needed, and no scholar is better furnished. As the controversy goes on between the classical and scientific ideas of education, the classics seem to be steadily losing ground, but there is no student of the New Testament that does not find it necessary to know the Greek language. He may make the discovery too late, and be crippled in his work for the rest of his life. But that need rarely be. Most men make it as soon as the preparation of a modern sermon begins, and then, if he has no adequate knowledge of the original language already, he sets himself to attain it, and may undoubtedly do so. He then finds that the first necessity of all is a sufficiently full and thoroughly reliable lexicon.

Professor Abbott-Smith is second to no one in our day in his appreciation of the importance of the papyri or in his knowledge of their contents. Every word or phrase in the most homely or most mercenary letter of the time is made use of, if there is anything in it to elucidate or illustrate the meaning of an apostle or evangelist. And it does happen, even though not often, that an obscure

New Testament word has its meaning at last securely determined; it sometimes happens that a flood of interesting light is thrown around the use of it.

But there is more than that. Professor Abbott-Smith has read with astonishing industry the suggestions offered, in books and magazines, by classical as well as New Testament scholars. It is on the whole a disappointing field, so strewn is it with the wrecks of exposed or exploded theories. What a wilderness of reading has a man to go through on the word *logos* alone! But it has to be done, and Dr. Abbott-Smith has done it. If there is a hopeful hint anywhere he has taken note of it. We are struck with the care with which he has read every volume and every number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. And his trained judgment has known what to refer to and what to pass by.

The great commentaries are of course in constant use. We see on every page references to the volumes of the 'International Critical Commentary,' to the 'Westminster' series, and to such single volumes as McNeile's *Matthew*, Swete's *Mark* and *Apocalypse*, Armitage-Robinson's *Ephesians*, and Mayor's *James*, and *Peter and Jude*. Then Edwin Abbott's wonderful books are frequently referred to, especially the *Johannine Grammar* and the *Johannine Vocabulary*. Dalman, Deissmann,



Burton, Blass, Ramsay, Kennedy, Schmidt, Thackeray, Jannaris, Thumb, and Moffatt are all in constant use. It is when in this way one runs rapidly over the recent work on New Testament lexicography that one realizes the urgent need for this new Lexicon: it is when one examines the Lexicon itself that one realizes how satisfactorily Dr. Abbott-Smith has met the need.

Let us quote the article on one of the words. It will be seen that the space is used to its utmost capacity. There is, of course, a list of abbreviations. Let us take

‘μυστήριον, -ου, τό (< μνέω), [in LXX: Da LXX TH 2<sup>18f.</sup> (7), To 12<sup>7. 11</sup>, Jth 2<sup>2</sup>, Wi 2<sup>22</sup> 6<sup>22</sup> 14<sup>15. 23</sup>, Si 3<sup>18</sup> 22<sup>22</sup> 27<sup>16. 17. 21</sup>, 2 Mac 13<sup>21\*</sup>;] 1. *that which is known to the μύστης (initiated), a mystery or secret doctrine*, mostly in pl., τὰ μ. (Æsch., Hdt., al.). 2. In later writers (Menand., *Incert.*, 168), that which may not be revealed (not, however, as in the modern sense, intrinsically difficult to understand), a *secret or mystery* of any kind (To, Jth, 2 Mac, 11. c.). 3. In NT, of the counsels of God (cf. Th.: Jb 15<sup>8</sup>, Ps 24<sup>2</sup> (25)<sup>14</sup> for 710), once hidden but now revealed in the Gospel or some fact thereof; (a) of the Christian revelation generally: Ro 16<sup>25</sup>, 1 Co 2<sup>7</sup>, Col 1<sup>26. 27</sup>, Eph 3<sup>3. 9</sup>; τ. βασιλείας τ. θεοῦ, Mk 4<sup>11</sup>; τ. θεοῦ, 1 Co 2<sup>1</sup>, Re 10<sup>7</sup>; τ. θ. Χριστοῦ, Col 2<sup>2</sup>; τ. Χριστοῦ, Col 4<sup>3</sup>, Eph 3<sup>4</sup>; τ. θελήματος αὐτοῦ, Eph 1<sup>9</sup>; τ. εὐαγγελίου, Eph 6<sup>19</sup>; τ. πίστεως, 1 Ti 3<sup>9</sup>; τ. εὐσεβείας, ib.<sup>16</sup>; (b) of particular truths, or details, of the Christian revelation: Ro 11<sup>25</sup>, 1 Co 15<sup>51</sup>, Eph 5<sup>32</sup>, 2 Th 2<sup>7</sup>, Re 1<sup>20</sup> 17<sup>5. 7</sup>; pl., τὰ μ., 1 Co 13<sup>2</sup> 14<sup>2</sup>; θεοῦ, 1 Co 4<sup>1</sup>; τ. βασιλείας τ. οὐρανῶν (θεοῦ), Mt 13<sup>11</sup>, Lk 8<sup>10</sup> (cf. Westc., *Eph.*, 180 ff.; AR, *Eph.*, 234 ff.; Lft., *Col.* 165 f.; Hatch, *Essays*, 57 f.; DB, iii. 465 ff.; DCG, ii. 213 ff.).’

It is a fine generous volume, beautifully and accurately printed at the Aberdeen University Press. For cheapness the twelfth volume of the *ENCYCLOPEDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS* will compete with it: we have seen no other volume that can even approach it.

How Dr. Moulton would have rejoiced had he lived to see this Lexicon issued, in the progress of which he took so much interest.

### THE RELIGIONS OF MANKIND.

There is no study so imperative at present as the study of Religion. But it must be study. Easy

offhand writing and reading on ‘the religions of the world’ has done immense mischief. Wrong notions have become accepted truths. Wrong estimates have become ineradicable beliefs. Worst of all, the so-called student of Religion is content with a superficial knowledge which has no light or shade, and is worthy of neither God nor man. And then he preaches on Religion, lectures on it, even writes books on it.

But this is inapplicable to Mr. Edmund D. Soper, Professor of the History of Religion in Northwestern University. His book on *The Religions of Mankind* (Allen & Unwin; 12s. 6d.) is the book of a serious student, a student determined to reach values, and capable of appreciating them. He has used the *ENCYCLOPEDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS* to some purpose. The only fault one can find is that the aim is popular—just escaping the abuse of that much-tried adjective. For we do not want the study of Religion popularized; we want it made a study. What is it that the people to whom we minister in sacred things should be able to pronounce Hinayana and Mahayana? We are not teachers of speech, to bid them speak such words trippingly on the tongue; we are teachers of God, whom we must direct them to seek after and find. A greater blunder no man could commit than to carry to his hearers or readers the impression that he can give them an hour’s entertainment on the peculiarities of man’s quest for God. Professor Soper does not commit that blunder.

### MODERNISM AND THE CHRISTIAN FAITH.

*Modernism and the Christian Faith* is the title which Dr. John Alfred Faulkner, Professor of Church History in Drew Theological Seminary, has given to his latest book. Published in America in 1921 (and noticed here), it is now issued in this country by Messrs. Allen & Unwin (12s. 6d. net).

It is an estimate of Modernism—Roman and Anglican. For thus far it seems to be a luxury of those two communions. It is a robust but reverent estimate. Professor Faulkner sees that the issues are vital; he sees also that the men are capable. He has no expectation of carrying everything before him at the first rush, but if he loses in the end he knows that all is lost.



The whole matter turns on the person of Jesus. Authority? He is the final, the impassable authority. Miracle? He is the only Miracle. Given the miracle of His Person (and strangely enough nearly all Modernists give it) all other miracle worth following follows. The difficulty is that the facts of His Person are acknowledged—facts that are summed up in the word ‘sinlessness’ or moral perfection—but the conclusion is not taken. If He really did no sin, if guile was not found in His mouth, who was He? Man? The better man the more incredibly only man. The difficulty of saying God is admitted. Professor Faulkner admits it. But you are shut up to it. For certainly the Modernist is the last to allow a demi-god.

A striking quotation is made from F. A. B. Nitzsch. Then says Dr. Faulkner: ‘Weighty words are these by Nitzsch. Study them. They show how to candid and spiritually minded Ritschlians Christ breaks down the boundaries reared by their master, and you get in its logical drive at least the historic view: “the correlate of one’s religious self-consciousness; . . . the society of believers takes hold of him as the root of its being, and believers as both the origin and cause of their salvation; . . . the Godman; . . . the unique *being* (not simply revelation) of God in him; . . . he founds the forgiveness of sins; . . . he communicates the Holy Spirit.” Who but God could do and could mean all that? And that was the Christ of the early Christians. That was the Christ they confessed, they worshipped, and for whom they died. And because they did so the society he founded and they established exists to-day.’

#### GENTILE.

Pronounce the word in three syllables. ‘Giovanni Gentile was born at Casteltravano in Sicily the 29th May 1875. He was educated at Pisa and later was appointed to the Chair of Philosophy in the University of that city. In 1917 he received the appointment he now holds of Professor of the History of Philosophy in the University of Rome. He has become famous in his own country on account of his historical and philosophical writings and even more by the number and fervour of the disciples he has attracted. . . . It is doubtful if there is a more influential teacher in the intellectual world to-day.’

So says Professor Wildon Carr, and he says so with knowledge and deliberation. Professor Wildon Carr has translated into English Gentile’s latest and best book, *The Theory of Mind as Pure Act* (Macmillan; 15s. net). It was not an easy book to translate. It is not an easy book to read. But when one approaches it after a good deal of reading in Croce, the difficulty is not insurmountable. Still, it is written for philosophers, and Dr. Wildon Carr has rendered the unprofessional reader of philosophy a real service by the clear statement of Gentile’s philosophical position which he has given in his Introduction.

‘In recent times,’ he says, ‘there have been two philosophical movements which have received in Italy the response of a vigorous recognition. One is the Positive philosophy, the leading representative of which is the veteran philosopher Roberto Ardigò of Padua (born 1828 and still living at the time of writing). In early life a priest who rose from humble origin to a high position in the Church, he was distinguished by his political zeal and public spirit in pushing forward schemes of social and municipal reform, and had brilliant prospect of advancement. Suddenly, however, and dramatically, he broke with the Church and became the leader of a secularist movement, and the expounder of the principles of the philosophy of Auguste Comte. In consequence, this philosophy has had, and still has, a great following and wide influence in Italy. It is important to understand this, because it explains the constant polemic against positivism and positivistic concepts in the present work.

‘The other movement is Hegelian in character and idealistic in direction, and its leading exponents are Benedetto Croce and his younger colleague and friend the author of this book. The distinctive note and the starting-point of this movement is a reform of the Hegelian dialectic, but it prides itself in an origin and philosophical ancestry much older than Hegel, going back to Vico and through him linking itself up with the old Italian learning. Its characteristic doctrine is a theory of history and of the writing of history which identifies history with philosophy. It finds full expression in the present book.’

This is the first volume of a new series which is meant to contain the whole of Gentile’s ‘Philosophical Works.’



*SIR HENRY JONES' GIFFORD  
LECTURES.*

Art for art's sake: the Gifford Lectures for the value of the Gifford Lectures, and no moralizing, please. But there are exceptions. Professor Gwatkin openly refused to be bound by Lord Gifford's conception of religion and delivered the most useful series that the Gifford lectureship has given us. Sir Henry Jones refused also. He said: 'That for which Lord Gifford stipulated cannot be unreservedly granted. To accede at once to his wish, "that the lecturers should treat their subject as a strictly natural Science . . . just as astronomy or chemistry is," were to proceed on assumptions that are admitted neither by Sceptics, nor by Agnostics, nor by many religious believers.' And he proceeded to deliver a course of lectures with a purpose.

His purpose is to show that Theism can be proved true intellectually. At the beginning he has the Christian theologian, still more definitely the Scottish minister, in his mind. With the least suggestion of loftiness, he assures him that he may safely speak his mind, that he may even examine the sources of his beliefs; and he will find that it is no longer necessary for him either to believe what is incredible or to preach what he does not believe.

That over, the rest of the way is clear. Sir Henry Jones does all that man can do to set religion, the religion of a twentieth-century lecturer, on a sound intellectual basis. He will have no psychological intrusion. The Subconscious? There is no such thing. 'Psychologists who speak of consciousness as if it were extended, and refer to it as a "field," have invented "a subconscious region," in which these presuppositions abide and from which they may emerge at times. As a matter of fact, there is no such region and there are no such denizens.'

Again, intuition does not exist: 'We speak of intuitive minds, as if there were some men to whom the laborious processes of ratiocination were a mere cumbersome redundancy. As a matter of fact, the musician and painter and poet can as little do without observation and judgment, purposeful reason and will, as they can without their intuitions. Their intuitions are always the fruition of a toilsome experience. And what is true of the æsthetic is not less true of the religious spirit.'

Once more, there is, or ought to be, no such thing as dogma. This is the theologian's prime offending. He is not an inquirer, he is a dogmatizer. But is there not a confusion? The Church may be (must be?) a dogmatizer; the individual may be (must be) an inquirer. For him, as individual, to make general laws out of his individual discoveries is wrong—is it ever done? But when he and his fellows get together for the purpose of finding principles on which they can work harmoniously for the Kingdom of God, it cannot be left undone.

Sir Henry Jones has given us some things to think about. His belief in God, a God of power as well as love, is as refreshing as it is robust. His belief in this as the best of all possible worlds is as unexpected as it is true. His belief in Religion is as timely as it is well taken:

'What value would the secular life retain if it were completely sundered from religion? Expunge all traces of religious belief; delete all the effects it has ever had in the life of man and of human society; extinguish the hopes it has kindled, the fears it has awakened, its restraints and its inspirations, its trust in the ascendancy of what is good; reduce the meaning and reach of good to purely secular values, how much of what man treasures most would remain? Is a genuinely irreligious consciousness entitled to regard the world as a cosmos, and would any higher form of morality survive than that which is prudential and radically self-regarding and responsive to no imperatives that could be called duties? What is the range of the purely "natural" virtues of man? Could any virtue survive if an ultimate good were known not to exist? The moral lights would certainly be very low and man's strides to his ill-lit purposes would be hesitating. And would the conception or the hope, or even the desire of immortality survive? Could man wish to extend his existence in a world where there was no Best in power; pursuing interests incapable of being reconciled, all of them perishable; the inequalities of the present life finally uncorrected and justice sitting powerless? For it is such a scene as that which the life of mankind presents if no spiritual principles connect its details and give them significance, and if it terminates finally here.'

The title is *A Faith that Enquires* (Macmillan; 18s. net).



*THE HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY.*

*An Introduction to the History of Christianity* has been written by Dr. F. J. Foakes Jackson, Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge, and Professor of Christian Institutions in Union Theological Seminary, New York (Macmillan; 20s. net). The period covered by the volume is from 590 to 1314, not the whole of the History of Christianity, but enough for a single volume.

Professor Foakes Jackson's manner is quiet, serious, thoughtful. There is no rhetoric, not an adjective with too much colour in it. That is not to say that it is a dry book. It is not. But there is little movement emotionally. All is for study, for thinking, none for loving, or fearing, or willing, or doing.

'The thirteenth century, for all its achievements, marks the beginning of the decay of the medieval system. The fourth Council of the Lateran in 1215 crystallised the doctrine of the Western Church. The council met on St. Martin's day, November 11th, and Innocent, after preaching from the words, "With desire have I desired to eat this passover with you," caused seventy canons prepared by himself to be read, which were accepted by the assembled prelates. The council lasted only till the end of the month.

'The first canon embodied a declaration of faith. The opening clause contains the doctrine of the Trinity and adds that all things were created by God—even the demons, who were created good, fell into sin, and led man astray.

'The next part is an exposition of the Catholic faith in the Incarnation, in the Resurrection and Ascension of our Lord's Body and Spirit, in His second coming as Judge, when all will rise in their own bodies to inherit eternal punishment or eternal salvation.

'Thirdly it is affirmed that there is but one universal Church, outside which no one can be saved. In it Christ is the Priest and the Victim. His Body and Blood are truly in the sacrament of the altar under the species of bread and wine. These are *transubstantiated* by divine power in order that we may partake of His Body, as He partook of our body. Only a priest can consecrate this sacrament, according to the power of the keys. Baptism must be in the name of the Trinity, and is valid if the invocation is right, whoever the minister may be. Those who receive it obtain

salvation; if they fall into sin, they may recover their innocence by true penitence. Not only virgins who live lives of continence deserve salvation, but also married persons if they please God by a pure faith and by good works.'

That is a fair example of Dr. Foakes Jackson's style. At the end of each chapter there is a list of Authorities. The whole work, including these lists, gives confidence. We may not be greatly moved; we can trust.

*GEORGE LLOYD HODGKIN.*

The biography of *George Lloyd Hodgkin* has been printed for private circulation, but copies can be obtained from the Society of Friends' Bookshop, Bishopsgate, London, E.C. 2, either direct or through any bookseller.

It is the biography of a Quaker, who, when the war came, refused absolutely to have to do with it. Whence trouble. And yet most considerate were the authorities, for they knew the man's worth. Finally a mission to Mesopotamia saved the situation, but cost him his life. He died of dysentery at Bagdad on June 24, 1918.

Wherein lies the interest? For its interest is undoubted. In the beauty of Christian character. Not life, not activity, not work done, simply character. He did little work. He settled down to nothing until a common clerkship came his way after he was a husband. But he helped others to do better work than they would have done—yet more, to be better than they would have been.

When he died there were visions and revelations. 'Each one of those most near to him in England had a message or intimation from him either on that midsummer day on which he was set free, or very shortly afterwards. To some there came an indescribable feeling of liberty, of exhilaration and uplift. . . . To others, more.

'His mother, early on the morning of the 26th, knowing nothing as yet of the cable already received, or of the later cable so swiftly to follow, was conscious in a dream just before she woke of a marvellous light and sense of happiness. She distinctly heard a voice saying to her: "The Angel of my Deliverance has saved me." She was then staying at Sheffield with Lily, and came down to breakfast, saying: "I have had the most beautiful dream." Not until the news reached her a few hours later did she connect the voice with George,



though Lily's husband, Herbert Gresford Jones, mentioned him specially at Prayers that morning. Meanwhile our mother went about all day with no anxiety about him or anyone—nothing but thankfulness and joy.

'That same day also, 26th June, Mary's mother, Theodora Wilson, was in the train going to "break the news to Mary." There came a moment when even her courage failed, at the thought of what she had to do. Then she suddenly saw George's laughing face, saw him—"just George, but his own most gay and radiant self," and heard his voice say: "It is all right, mother; don't be troubled. I have been there before." Arrived at Banbury, she found the little house full of peace. Through a friend the news had already reached Mary. George had indeed "been there before."

'Thus, tranquilly, calmly, and as he would have wished, the selfless life lived among us here passes into the yet more utterly selfless life they live in "yonder."

### SPIRITISM.

How utterly impossible it is for a preacher to preach with any confidence who does not know something of the history of religion is shown by Professor Lewis Bayles Paton in his book on *Spiritism and the Cult of the Dead in Antiquity* (Hodder & Stoughton; 16s. net). Let the subject be the life to come. The most likely text for the uninstructed preacher is Job 19<sup>25-27</sup>, 'For I know that my redeemer liveth.' We know what he will make of it.

But it is not only that Job expresses no hope of a life beyond the grave there. We may see that, and say it, and yet be far astray. We cannot explain this expression of the mind of Job unless we try to understand the religious ideas which lay at the back of his mind. Professor Paton comes to it, as we must all come, gradually. He begins with the thoughts of the savage. He passes to the early Israelite. He comes to Job. He says: 'While Job was struggling with the mystery of his terrible sufferings, loss of wealth, loss of children, and loss of health, and was unable to find any explanation for these either as the punishment of the sins of his ancestors, or as punishment for his own sins; and was tempted to deny that an all-wise, all-powerful, and all-righteous God ruled the world; the question suddenly flashed into his

mind, Was it not possible that a vindication of his innocence might come after death? That could not be in Sheol, since there conscious existence ceased, but might not God bring him back to life again, so that on earth and in the flesh he should receive the reward of virtue? The cut-down tree revives. May not man also awaken from the sleep of death?

"There is hope for a tree, if it be cut down,  
that it will sprout again,  
And that the tender branch thereof will not  
cease.

Though the root thereof wax old in the earth,  
And the stock thereof die in the ground;  
Yet through the scent of water it will bud,  
And put forth boughs like a plant" (Job 14: 7-9).

At first the poet rejects the thought of resurrection as inconceivable.

"But a man dieth, and is prostrate,  
And a mortal expieth, and where is he?  
As the water vanisheth from the sea,  
And as the river drieth up and is arid,  
So man lieth down, and doth not arise:  
Till the heavens be no more, they shall not  
awake,  
Nor be roused out of their sleep" (14: 10-12).

But the new hope that has risen within him still asserts itself.

"O that thou wouldest hide me in Sheol,  
That thou wouldest conceal me until thy  
wrath should turn away,  
That thou wouldest appoint me a set time  
and remember me.  
If a man die, shall he live again?  
All the days of my enlistment would I wait,  
Till my discharge should come,  
Till thou shouldest call, and I should answer  
thee,  
Till thou shouldest long for the work of thy  
hands" (14: 13-15).

The hope here expressed does not mount to the height of assertion, and the theme is not pursued farther at this point; but in 19: 25-27 Job again returns to it, and this time states as a conviction what before had been only a vague longing.

"But I know that my avenger liveth,  
And one who shall survive after I am dust:



And that another shall rise as my witness,  
 And that he shall set up his mark.  
 From my flesh shall I see God:  
 Whom I shall see for myself,  
 And mine eyes shall behold, and no stranger."

This cannot refer, as many commentators have supposed, to a vision of God in the other world, for Job has asserted too often his conviction that there is no knowledge in Sheol (Job 7:9; 14:21; 17:15 f.). It must be interpreted in the light of the hope that struggles to expression in 14:7-15, that there is such a thing as a return from Sheol to the life upon earth. "From my flesh," accordingly, cannot mean "disembodied," but must mean "re-embodied." The vindication of a disembodied spirit would be at variance with the whole development of Old Testament thought up to this point.

### JOHN ALLEN.

John Allen had friends at Cambridge who became famous—Alfred Tennyson, William Makepeace Thackeray, Edward Fitzgerald—and the interest of his biography, which has been written by one of his eight daughters (Anna Otter Allen), lies largely in the fact that he kept up a correspondence with these friends. Letters to and from them are freely quoted, even though in most cases (as is frankly stated) they have already appeared in one or other of their biographies; and a sense is felt throughout the book of being in the company of the great when they are at their best, even if not their greatest. Many other men and some women are introduced to us, chiefly those who visited John Allen at his country vicarage in the remote parish of Prees. And so the biography is appropriately called *John Allen and his Friends* (Hodder & Stoughton; 12s. 6d. net).

John Allen spent many years at Prees, a fine example of gifts and graces given without grudging to a few country people, who had great difficulty in appreciating and greater difficulty in acknowledging them. He became an Archdeacon and an Inspector of Schools. But John Allen of Prees is enough for the future historian of the saints.

One of those who visited frequently at Prees was Julia Sterling, the daughter of Carlyle's John Sterling. This is what she said about John Allen: 'The Archdeacon's simplicity, his humour akin to pathos, his laughter akin to tears, made him unlike

commonplace people. His sympathy was loving and living; the heart of a little child shone out of his bright eyes shaded by wonderful black brows. Ready feeling and fun trembled in his voice. His power of enjoyment in simple things made his company refreshing, while the wisdom and cultivation of his mind gave depth to his conversation. His unworldliness lent a rare dignity to his character, behind all the intense naturalness and fresh feeling which made conventional people seem tame in comparison. So affectionate was he that he won regard even from those he rebuked. His humility was lovely and unmistakeable, and his transparent truthfulness was a constant lesson and a standard to live by.'

### BORNEO.

Mr. Ivor H. N. Evans, B.A., was five years ago Assistant District Officer under the chartered company which rules British North Borneo. He now writes down his recollections. His memory is not quite fresh, as he frequently warns us, but it is easy to see that he took some pains to get at the truth of things, and takes some pains to tell it now. He is not in favour of administration by a company—whether of Borneo or any other land. 'I consider it a mistake to allow any body of men who have monetary interests to have absolute control over a large territory; for as long as human nature is what it is there must always be a temptation for the directors and shareholders in such a company to sanction—all honour to them if they do not—revenue-producing schemes which may be exceedingly damaging to the native peoples entrusted to their care. In fact there must be a possibility of those who are largely interested in a company caring little from what sources and in what manner dividends are procured, so long as they obtain them.'

Mr. Evans had contact with three tribes—the Dusuns, the Bajaus, and the Illanuns. The Bajaus and the Illanuns are alike, and he describes them and their ways together. But the Dusuns greatly differ from the other two tribes, and he gives a large part of his space to them, describing their dress and adornment, their houses, domestic affairs, and government, their agriculture, fishing, hunting and trapping, their food, narcotics, their courtship, marriage, divorce, burial and puberty rites, their music, their religion, and much else. It is all

instructive, and some of it is new. Their burial customs are peculiar, with sometimes peculiar results. 'Some few years ago there was a bad epidemic of small-pox in the Tuaran district, and the father of my Dusun servant, Omboi, caught the disease and "died." Whereupon his relatives, having obtained a jar of sufficient size, slipped the body into it, intending to bury it immediately. The neck of the jar was, however, rather narrow, and when the mourners began to stamp the body home with the flat of their feet the "corpse" got up and objected to the process in forcible language. The patient had merely been in a state of coma, and he eventually recovered.'

As always, there turns up the crime of crimes—the introduction of alcohol among the natives. Says Mr. Evans: 'The sale of cheap and fiery brandy, whisky, gin, and arrack, the vendors of which are the Chinese traders of the gambling and spirit monopolies, should be stringently forbidden. (In some districts near the coast the effects of cheap spirits upon the natives are even now, unfortunately, only too apparent.) The prohibition to be entirely effective would have to be absolute, since, if the sale of spirits were made an offence only to natives of the country, though it might to a certain extent prevent the rising generation from taking to drink, a native would merely go to the first Chinaman he knew and give him a present of five cents to purchase a bottle of gin for him.'

The title is: *Among Primitive Peoples in Borneo* (Seeley; 21s. net).

#### HENRY VI.

The volume on *Henry VI.* in the series on 'Kings and Queens of England,' edited by Professor Rait and Mr. Page, has been written by Mabel E. Christie (Constable; 16s. net).

It is a finely written study of a strangely fascinating man. In the chapter on Henry's character the biographer is at her best, drawn to the fulness of her quiet impressive power just by the good king's goodness. For goodness is best of all things in the end. It did not convince or convert Henry's subjects. No, they were beyond that possibility. They were too much given to the worship of war. But it convinces us; and in its straightforward telling here tends to convert us to itself.

'Henry was a simple and upright man, without guile or malice. He "coveted no revenge for

injuries, but gave God most humble thanks for the same." His charity and humanity were indeed remarkable, and in that ferocious age were probably considered a rather contemptible weakness. On one occasion it is related that "hearing that one of his servants had been deprived by theft of a great part of his goods, the said King sent him twenty nobles as compensation for his loss, at the same time advising him that he should now be more careful in the custody of his property, and that he should not go to law for this cause."'

It is the Sermon on the Mount believed in, lived by.

The story of Jeanne D'Arc and the loss of France is briefly but touchingly told.

The volume is richly illustrated and well furnished with maps.

#### ON TRANSLATING HOMER.

In the preface to his translation of *The Odyssey of Homer* (Constable; 6s.), Professor George Herbert Palmer tells us what his aims have been. He says:

'In this translation of the *Odyssey* I have had the following aims:

'To give to the thought of Homer a more direct and simple expression than has hitherto been judged admissible; to be at once minutely faithful to the Greek original and to keep out of sight the fact that either an original or a translator exists; to present especially the objective, unreflective, realistic, and non-literary features of the primitive story; to report in all their delicacy the events which Homer reports, to exhibit his attitude of mind toward them, and to produce again the impression produced by him that things did happen just so; in the wording, to discard originality and to make free use of the fortunate phrases of preceding translators, but to employ persistently the veracious language, the language of prose, rather than the dream language, the language of poetry; and still to confess that the story, unlike a bare record of fact, is throughout, like poetry, illuminated with an underglow of joy; to mark gently this permeating joy by a simple rhythm so unobtrusive and so free from systematic arrangement that no one need turn from the matter to mark the movement; above all, to discharge a debt of gratitude to the great friend who for twenty-five years has been showing me the beauty of himself and of the



world; and finally, to make it plain that I cannot attain these aims, and to commend them to others as alluring and impossible.'

How near has Professor Palmer come? In Professor Slater's lecture (noticed already) we read: 'When Odysseus in his wanderings holds converse with the dead in the underworld, among the souls of the men "killed in action" before Troy, he sees (you remember) the soul of the great Achilles, sick at heart from durance below and eager to exchange his sceptre in the shades for the sickle or the spade of a day-labourer on earth. What is his consolation? He asks for tidings of the New Age, for tidings of his son: and when Odysseus tells him that Neoptolemus has played the man and has done his day's work well, he is comforted.'

How does Professor Palmer translate that passage? We cannot give it all: 'Then when we entered the horse Epeius made—we chieftains of the Argives—and it lay all with me to shut or open our close ambush, other captains and councillors of the Danaans would wipe away a tear, and their limbs shook beneath them; but watching him, at no time did I see his fair skin pale, nor from his cheeks did he wipe tears away. Often he begged to leave the horse; he fingered his sword-hilt and his bronze-tipped spear, longing to vex the Trojans. Yet after we overthrew the lofty town of Priam, he took his share of spoil and an honourable prize, and went on board unharmed, not hit by brazen point nor wounded in close combat, as for the most part happens in war; hap-hazard Ares rages.'

'So I spoke, and the spirit of swift-footed Aeacides departed with long strides across the field of asphodel, pleased that I said his son was famous.'

### CARLYLE AND RUSKIN.

Mr. Frederick William Roe, Junior Dean and Associate Professor of English in the University of Wisconsin, has written an Introduction to *The Social Philosophy of Carlyle and Ruskin* (Allen & Unwin; 12s. 6d. net).

Professor Roe has none of the difficulty in reading either Carlyle or Ruskin that is so freely felt and so freely expressed in these days. He never believed that Carlyle was the advocate of might against right which he has been said to be. And in this book he shows conclusively enough that he was not. Nor did he ever conclude that Ruskin

had nothing for this generation to learn. Few pleasures of late years have been greater than the steady reading of Ruskin in Sir Edward Cook's grand edition, volume after volume, introductions, footnotes, and all. And this at least has been evident, it is evident even to those who are most contemptuous of Carlyle's and Ruskin's economics, that the way to write the English language cannot be better learnt than by the reading of Ruskin and Carlyle.

But it is their social philosophy that is in question. Recall this for Carlyle. It is found in *Past and Present*, and it was written years before its prophecies began to be realized. 'Of Time-Bill, Factory-Bill and other such Bills the present Editor has no authority to speak. He knows not, it is for others than he to know, in what specific ways it may be feasible to interfere, with Legislation, between the Workers and the Master-Workers;—knows only and sees, what all men are beginning to see, that Legislative interference, and interferences not a few are indispensable; that as a lawless anarchy of supply-and-demand, on market-wages alone, this province of things cannot longer be left. Nay interference has begun: there are already Factory Inspectors,—who seem to have no lack of work. Perhaps there might be Mine-Inspectors too:—might there not be Furrowfield Inspectors withal, and ascertain for us how on seven and sixpence a week a human family does live! Interference has begun; it must continue, must extensively enlarge itself, deepen and sharpen itself. Such things cannot longer be idly lapped in darkness, and suffered to go on unseen; the Heavens do see them; the curse, not the blessing of the Heavens is on an Earth that refuses to see them.

'Again, are not Sanitary Regulations possible for a Legislature? The old Romans had their *Ædiles*; who would, I think, in direct contravention to supply-and-demand, have rigorously seen rammed up into total abolition many a foul cellar in our Southwarks, Saint-Gileses, and dark poison-lanes; saying sternly, "Shall a Roman man dwell there?" The Legislature, at whatever cost of consequences, would have had to answer, "God forbid!"—The Legislature, even as it now is, could order all dingy Manufacturing Towns to cease from their soot and darkness; to let in the blessed sunlight, the blue of Heaven, and become clear and clean; to burn their coal-smoke, namely, and make flame of it.

Baths, free air, a wholesome temperature, ceilings twenty feet high, might be ordained, by Act of Parliament in all establishments licensed as Mills. There are such Mills already extant;—honor to the builders of them! The Legislature can say to others: "Go ye and do likewise; better if you can."

How many of our present legislators can prophesy like that? How many of them can move us to the performance?

Professor Roe is no blind worshipper; yet he is most convincing when he is least critical. To let us see what Carlyle and Ruskin really wanted—that is the best service he has rendered. It is a greater service than we are able just at present to appreciate.

Another book on the Atonement. This time by a Quaker. The writer is Mr. Edward Grubb, M.A., and the title *The Meaning of the Cross* (Allen & Unwin; 5s. net). It is a comparatively small book—small enough for its purpose. For Mr. Grubb gives the history of the doctrine (as nearly all writers on the Atonement do) as well as his own theory of it. And the necessary brevity makes for occasional unfairness. So, for example, with the ideas of Dale. In spite of Mr. Grubb's rather summary dismissal of Dale, there is truth in his demand that the righteous law of God (recognized by men and demanding recognition) must be upheld. When Absalom sinned, it was not enough, as Mr. Grubb would seemingly say, that he should be forgiven and the sin forgotten, however penitent he had become; it was necessary that the sense of rightness felt by the people, and clearly felt even by his indulgent father, should be recognized. We are much to blame if we miss the purpose of the parable of the Prodigal Son and give it the whole doctrine of the Atonement to carry.

Mr. Vivian MacMunn, in a book entitled *Neglected Galilee* (Allen & Unwin; 3s. 6d. net), makes an effort to prove (1) that there was a large body of Christ's disciples in existence in Galilee before the Resurrection; (2) that His appearance to this body of disciples, 500 strong, after the Resurrection, was the true Transfiguration, and the one referred to by St. Paul in 2 Co 3<sup>18</sup>, the Transfiguration described in St. Mark being 'a

mere substitute intended to show that our Lord's promise of the kingdom had been fulfilled in another way than by the resurrection-appearance on the Galilean mountain'; (3) that 'the Peræan section of Luke is really a piece of anti-Galilean polemic on the part of Jerusalem.'

That is enough for a man to make good in ninety-four pages. Mr. MacMunn has little difficulty in showing that the Galilean disciples existed—but the rest is unconvincing. And there are small things which make one suspicious. The parable of the Prodigal Son, 'for all its beauty, does not seem our Lord's own. . . . The man who penned that parable had drunk deeply of Christ's Spirit. Christ Himself might have spoken that parable had He been an inhabitant of Jerusalem; but, in fact, He was a Galilean.' Mr. MacMunn contra mundum.

Professor Henry Preserved Smith is a scholar. And wherever scholarship leads he follows. He has no respect for the weakness of the unlearned and ignorant. In his new book, *Essays in Biblical Interpretation* (Allen & Unwin; 10s. 6d. net), he refuses either to repeat the traditional interpretation of the Old Testament or to allegorize it. He believes that the traditional interpretation is not true, and he says so.

Can we accept his outspokenness? When Carlyle was told that Margaret Fuller had resolved to accept the Universe, he said, 'Gad! she'd better.' We had better accept H. P. Smith. Not all his findings, but his outspokenness. One of his chapters—the most difficult of all—is concerned with Survivals. Survivals are stories which belong to an earlier stage of religious development than the bulk of the Old Testament. They were incorporated in the text because of their point or their popularity. This is one of them:

'In the book of Exodus we have an anecdote which on examination shows itself to be of different tone from the narrative in which it is embedded. It tells that when Moses and his family were journeying through the desert their God, Yahweh, met them and was about to kill the prophet. Zipporah, his wife, with great presence of mind, took a sharp stone and circumcised her infant son, then smeared the blood on her husband's body, whereupon the angry divinity spared him (Ex. iv. 24-26). The more we look at the story the more we are puzzled by it. Moses was the chosen



instrument of Yahweh for the deliverance of Israel from bondage; he was returning to Egypt to obey the divine command; no oversight is charged against him or against his wife; neglect to circumcise his child, which is traditionally made the occasion of the anger, is nowhere mentioned in the narrative. To crown all, there is no parallel for the use of circumcision blood in the way indicated in the text.

'On the other hand, parallels can be pointed out in primitive religions, so-called. It is a common belief that the *genius loci* must be placated whenever a new location for tent or house is chosen. For this reason the custom of making a foundation sacrifice for every new building is wide-spread. The anecdote we are considering is apparently a local saga which has been transferred to Moses and Yahweh. Blood being a powerful charm it is used to ward off hostile spirits; and while human blood is not employed for this purpose in Hebrew ritual, there is no reason why it should not be so applied. Circumcision brings the boy into the fellowship of the clan, and so with the God of the clan. In fact circumcision is the seal of the covenant by which Yahweh and Israel are bound together. The application of the blood would thus remind the God of His relations with His people, and so the charm would be doubly effective. We might remind ourselves here that in the account of Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac, the boy is bound and laid on the wood of the altar, evidently in order that the blood may flow directly on to the altar, another instance contrary to the usual custom showing that the human blood is effective with the divinity.'

*A Short History of our Religion*, from Moses to the Present Day—what an undertaking! And what an accomplishment! For Mr. D. C. Somervell has done it, within about 350 pages (Bell; 6s. net). What is most of all to be astonished at is the readableness of the book.

But is he accurate? Can one man cover all the ground authoritatively? Yes, he is all right everywhere, so far as we can discover, until he comes to describe the organization of the Presbyterian Churches in Scotland. But then! Here are two sentences: 'Kirk-session also appoints the minister and can virtually dismiss him. The majority consists of elders elected by the congregation.' The first sentence is hopeless. As for the second, one

can point out that all the Kirk-session are elders except the minister, and he is an elder too.

Does that damn the book? It does not even damage it. For every Englishman blunders over the Presbyterian system of Church Government, and his fellow-Englishmen think the better of him for his blundering.

We said the book reads well. That should be emphasized. You will read it rejoicingly from cover to cover.

Professor D. A. Slater's *Sortes Vergilianae* (Blackwell; 2s. net) is enough to send us all to the side of the Latinists and the study of Vergil. That is what the seer can do, even when he is a university professor. It is Professor Slater's inaugural lecture before the University of Liverpool. And, unless he has shot his one and only bolt, we envy the students in classics of that University. For here is stimulus to thought and here is literary charm beyond all believing.

A volume of *Parish Sermons* preached in St. John's Church, New Haven, Conn., by the Rector, Stewart Means, D.D., has been published in Oxford by Mr. Blackwell (10s. net). It is an attractive volume with those broad margins to the page with which some American publishers are so generous. More than that, it is a volume of powerful preaching. There is not a breath of sensationalism in it. The texts and topics are the most universal. The thought is true to the Scripture and the language is true to the thought.

Is there any particular quality that stamps the Jew as Jew? Mr. H. G. Enelow asks the question in *The Jew and the World* (Bloch Pub. Co., New York). His answer is universalism. And is it not true? For what end was Abraham called? 'That in thee and in thy seed should all the families of the earth be blessed.' "The universal religion of mankind," exclaims Edouard Schuré, the French mystic, "was the true mission of Israel!" "Though few Jews seem to know it," he adds complainingly. But how many non-Jews know it?

For the elementary principles of social life, and in particular for a clear leading in the matters of our own responsibility, read *The Groundwork of Social Reconstruction* by William Glover (Cambridge: at the University Press; 2s. 6d. net). Mr.

Glover is well informed, and so he can express himself in the simplest language. He finds three Me's that have to be considered—the Material Me, the Social Me, and the Spiritual Me; and according as one or other is first in our thoughts our aim is egoism, prudentialism, or idealism. His demand is for an idealism that shall be free from narrowness and fragmentariness.

*An Introduction to Ecclesiastical Latin* has been written by the Rev. H. P. V. Nunn, M.A., St. John's College, Cambridge (Cambridge: at the University Press; 6s. net). Mr. Nunn has already written an Introduction to New Testament Greek as well as a Short Syntax of New Testament Greek. He seems to see what the student needs; he has the scholarship to supply the need. This book might almost be called an Introduction to the Study of the Vulgate, for from the Vulgate nearly all the examples are chosen, and it is just as an Introduction to the Vulgate that it will be of most service.

There is a full account (to take a single example) of the ecclesiastical use of *quod*, which came at last to cover most of the senses which in classical Latin are expressed by the accusative and infinitive or a clause with *ut*. From this free use of *quod* descend the many uses of *que* in French and *che* in Italian.

Do you know what it costs to make a Persian carpet? You may know what it costs to buy it.

'The hours of the carpet-weavers are from sunrise to sunset, the age of the workers is 5, 6, 7, and upwards. "They are paid at the rate of 2d. a day." Any one who has sat on a seat where he could reach the floor, or who has watched children, has noticed that the feet are crossed at the ankle. "Twelve hours daily." Those who know anything about the soft bones of childhood know what it means—those children are rendered cripples, hopeless cripples for life. In one factory where the children were examined, thirty-six out of thirty-eight were crippled or deformed in some way. "I have just admitted a child of 7, I think, suffering from starvation fever. She is so weak, but quite conscious, and says nothing but: 'Cold water,' and 'Let me lie still.' Her mother is dead, her father has left her. She had been sent to weave when she was 5, but broke down utterly three months ago, but as she was bound for three years and her grandparents had drawn all her wages in advance the master would not let her off, and her aunt car-

ried her daily to the factory. Too weak to speak, dear wee mite, she is lying gently stroking her turkey-red pillow."

You will find that and much else in *Glimpses of Persia*, by M. M. Wood (Ch. Miss. Soc.; 1s. 6d.).

Has a Socialist ever written a Life of Christ? Dr. Alexander Irvine comes very near it. His new book, *The Carpenter and His Kingdom* (Collins; 7s. 6d. net), is the Life of Christ by one who himself knows what it means to have nowhere to lay his head. Does he understand Christ better for his acquaintance with hunger and nakedness? He believes that at any rate he understands better some of His teaching.

Take this: 'In Matthew the "poor" become "poor in spirit," and hunger becomes "hungering and thirsting after righteousness." He may be avoiding the inference that the Kingdom belonged to the poor because they were poor. An idea that could not have been in the mind of Jesus. But Luke's record is not improved by Matthew's addition. If words have not lost their meaning, "poor in spirit" means, not humility or self-abasement, but poverty of character. When a man becomes conscious that God is all, and he in comparison is nothing, he is rich in spirit—not poor. The Church has consistently rejected the Ebionism of Luke, and has given us instead the Ebionism of Matthew, which expresses itself in a slavish social and spiritual subserviency and a beggar-whine.

'Jesus did not promise the poor monopoly of the Kingdom. He said it was theirs. There was nothing else to which they could make any claim. They were poor because they were exploited and robbed. They were a majority of the people, they crowded around Him. They had hope in Him—they had hope in nothing else. The Romans and the Jewish hierarchy bled them white—now at last they have a champion who, knowing all they had suffered, offers them something to offset their poverty—the Kingdom of God!

'When Jesus said that a camel could as easily go through the eye of a needle as a rich man could enter heaven, no Evangelist toned it down, but the Commentators did. They said, by "the eye of a needle" He meant one of the gates of Jerusalem! Jesus neither excludes the rich from heaven nor gives a monopoly of it to the poor. He states a fundamental fact; that it is hard for the rich to choose the things of the spirit while for the poor it



is at least easier. In hungering and thirsting for righteousness the will to eat and drink is all that is required. The food of the spirit is plentiful—while the assurance of even a minimum existence is as yet a dream unrealised.'

It is more than a Life of Christ, it is an exposition of His teaching. And whatever else it is, it is modern. The words of our Lord, in this man's hands, are words for you and for me to-day.

Messrs. Constable have issued new editions, in compact size and clear printing, of Professor F. G. Peabody's College Sermons. Their titles are *Mornings in the College Chapel* (two volumes), *Afternoons in the College Chapel*, and *Evenings in the College Chapel* (3s. 6d. net each).

Two valuable little books as aids in the campaign for prohibition have been written by the President of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference, the Rev. J. Alfred Sharp. One he calls *Economic Aspects of Temperance*, the other *The Drink Problem in Relation to National Health* (Epworth Press; 6d. net each). They have telling points, and their points are unassailable.

A reliable and timely book is *Efficient Church Finance* (5s. net). It has been compiled by Adam B. Keay in co-operation with Sir Andrew H. Pettigrew, J.P., Robert Headrick, Andrew Houston, and other gentlemen representing the International Business Men's Committee on Church Finance.

The time has clearly come for a revision of the methods of Church finance everywhere. The present methods are antiquated and inefficient as a government department. And the revision must be undertaken and done by laymen. Well, here they are—capable, consecrated men. And they mean business. The scheme called 'The Weekly Freewill Offering System' is already a success, an assured success. It has to be made universal. Let treasurers everywhere find this book and read it. Then will they commend the scheme to their pastors and their people with confidence. All the facts are here, and they are facts.

The book may be obtained from Mr. C. F. Garrood at 4 Fleet Lane, London, E.C.

If the children's sermon is the most difficult part of the modern service, the parable is the most

difficult sort of children's sermon. The Rev. J. W. G. Ward, of New Court Church, Tollington Park, London, preaches parables to children. And so successfully that he has got a name thereby. Can others follow? We shall quote one of his children's sermons in 'Virginibus Puerisque,' but not a parable. The title of the book is *Parables for Little People* (Hodder & Stoughton: 6s. net).

A small unbound volume of private prayer, entitled *Prayers in the Presence*, has been prepared by the Rev. F. W. Drake, Rector of Kirby Misperton (Longmans; 1s. 6d. net).

*A Dream of Heaven* (Longmans; 6s. 6d. net) is a volume of sermons preached on special occasions. For the Rev. Robert Kane, S.J., is recognized in the Roman Church as both a scholar and a preacher. Whenever some church is having its Centenary, its Golden, or even its Silver Jubilee, it sends for Mr. Kane. He chooses topics that are appropriate to the occasion and at the same time of public interest—at least to Roman Catholics. Such a topic is Purgatory.

Preaching on Purgatory in Dublin he said: 'That in Purgatory the imprisoned souls suffer real physical pain seems to be beyond all doubt. It is universally asserted by the Teachers of the Church, and it is universally accepted by the faithful taught. That this physical pain is the result of the burning of actual fire is, broadly speaking, the opinion of the Doctors of the Church, and it is the conviction of her saints.' But after a little he added: 'But when we come to ask whether that physical fire of which the saints and doctors speak is exactly of that very same kind and sort as that material fire in which the carbon of the coal is caught and consumed, with searching heat and rending flame, by the oxygen of the air, it is not easy to understand what we must believe to be the accurate meaning of their message. Material burning is unthinkable except as the destruction of what is burned.'

So there are difficulties in every Church, and each has its own. Mr. Kane is a wise as well as a popular preacher.

If you are accustomed to visit the British Museum you are sure to know by sight Mr. Frank G. Jannaway. He is not one of the officials. But he knows every nook and cranny. He goes some-

times to *The British Museum with Bible in Hand*, and if you go with him, he will show you all the statues and inscriptions which illustrate the text of the Old and New Testament. Under that title he has issued a volume which is well written and well illustrated (Sampson Low; 3s. 6d. net). If you cannot go to the Museum it will take the Museum to you.

The Rev. T. G. Bonney, Sc.D., LL.D., was born in 1833. He has now written his autobiography. *Memories of a Long Life* he calls the book (Cambridge: Metcalfe; 7s.). He has written easily and pleasantly, mostly about himself—what else is autobiography? In the end, however, about other men—William Hallows Miller, G. G. Stokes, Adam Sedgwick, Isaac Todhunter, Charles Kingsley, Mandell Creighton, Edward Henry Palmer.

Of Kingsley he says: 'A walk with him through the great pine woods near Bramshill was redolent of "My Winter Garden," and recalled the spirit of "North Devon" in his *Prose Idylls*. But the Sunday's experience was never to be forgotten. I went with him in his pony carriage to a school-room service in an outlying part of his parish. On the way he stopped at a cottage to take up an old and infirm couple, the man in his smock-frock, his wife correspondingly attired. Kingsley alighted and helped them into the carriage without the slightest trace of patronage, but with a true deference and courtesy such as he might have shown to his own father and mother. The service ended with a celebration, in which his tone and manner expressed the most heartfelt devotion.

'But one realized the man as a whole most of all when we retired at night from the drawing-room to his study. It was a good-sized room in what seemed to be the oldest part of the house. A strong beam ran across the ceiling, from which a cord-hammock (South American, I think) was suspended. Into this he got, lit a long clay pipe, and began to talk, wandering from topic to topic, about birds and beasts, fishes, insects, and plants, geology and geography, church history in the earlier centuries, and all the ways of men. I have never known anyone so interesting and delightful a talker as Charles Kingsley.'

The latest of the Ingersoll Lectures on Immortality is by Professor William Wallace Fenn. The

title is *Immortality and Theism* (Humphrey Milford; 4s. 6d. net).

After touching on Spiritualism, distantly but not disrespectfully, Professor Fenn passes to the fact of God. That means immortality. There are four lines of evidence: one rational, one moral, one æsthetic, one religious. Briefly, but very clearly and confidently, Professor Fenn runs along them all. It is a book to be read in half an hour, to remain with one a lifetime.

Mr. N. C. Mukerji, M.A., Professor of English Literature and Moral Philosophy in the Ewing Christian College, Allahabad, has written a volume on *Christian Theism and Idealism*. It is the second part of a work the first part of which dealt with 'The Ethics of Martineau and Idealism.' This volume contains four essays: (1) Professor Pringle Pattison on Creation; (2) God and the Absolute; (3) Idealism and Immortality; (4) Idealism and the Problem of Evil. Though written for Indian students, the book is scholarly enough to be well worth the attention of students of philosophy anywhere.

*A Book of Prayers*, together with Psalms and Hymns and Spiritual Songs, has been compiled by Charles W. Leffingwell, D.D., LL.D., Rector Emeritus of St. Mary's School, Knoxville, Illinois (Milwaukee: Morehouse Publishing Co.; 90 cents). It follows the Prayer Book. It is meant for private or public use in schools.

Messrs. Pickering & Inglis have published a new edition of Mr. George Goodman's book on Worship, Ministry, Service, and Christian Living. Its title is *God's Principles of Gathering* (2s. 6d. net).

'Remy de Gourmont, who was born in 1858, and died early in the Great War, is the most original and arresting figure in recent French literature. Had he lived it is possible that he might in time have taken the place of Anatole France, whom he already rivalled by the ease and elegance of his style and the philosophic temper of his mind, surpassing him even by the range of his intellectual interests and the variety of his production. Poet, critic, dramatist, scholar, biologist, philosopher, novelist, philologist, and grammarian, he practised every form and cultivated every sub-



ject, leaving upon all the impress of his mind and personality.'

The quotation is from the Publisher's statement in issuing a translation of a few of Gourmont's essays under the title of *Decadence* (Grant Richards; 7s. 6d. net). The translation is made by William Aspenwall Bradley.

It is a French book. Its attitude to things sexual is French. 'The sole natural end of man is reproduction'—that is French.

It is a French essayist's book. Its paradoxes are a French essayist's paradoxes. 'And why, it might be asked, should a guilty man be punished? It would seem, on the contrary, as if the innocent man, who is supposed to be healthy and normal, were much more capable of supporting punishment than the guilty man, who is sick and weakly. Why should not the imbecile, who has let himself be robbed, be punished instead of the robber, who has certain excuses to offer? That is what justice would decree if, instead of a theological conception, it were still, as at Sparta, an imitation of nature. Nothing exists save by virtue of disequilibrium, of injustice. Every existence is a theft practised upon other existences. No life flourishes except in a cemetery.' That is French. For the essayist in France has to write paradoxically now or he is passed by.

There is no morality, then, and no religion. There is only science. And science says, 'Whatever thy mind desires to do, do it, however lecherous. But out of the region of things sexual Gourmont is sane and sometimes penetrating. The essay on 'Subconscious Creation' is full of true things, as well as surprising things. The most surprising are the most true.

Christianity must be a big thing if it can be 'presented' in fourteen different ways and yet be Christianity. The Rev. J. E. Roscoe, M.A., B.Litt., describes the fourteen ways in *Presentations of Christianity*, a small unbound book published by Messrs. Skeffington (1s. net). There is the Spiritual Presentation, the Sacramental Presentation, the Scholastic Presentation, and all the rest, on to the Art Presentation.

The Rev. H. W. Workman, M.A., Vicar of St. Paul's, Southsea, has written 'an interesting book on Faith-healing. That is not the whole purpose of the book. Its purpose is to lead us to a full

redemption, the redemption of body, soul, and spirit. Hence the title *The Glory of Redemption* (Skeffingtons; 3s. 6d. net). But the most confident message it carries is that of the use of Faith, together with the doctor's skill, in the healing of the body. Mr. Workman shows that to exercise faith is to work along with Nature; for Nature, even with a capital letter, is just the Finger of God.

Mr. E. H. Blakeney, M.A., has made a selection of *Readings from the Apocrypha* (S.P.C.K.; cloth 1s. 6d., paper 1s. net). His object is simply to make English readers acquainted with the contents of the Apocryphal books, and he has used the Authorized Version. In Notes, however, he has amended that version pretty frequently and always acceptably. A short general Introduction, and an introduction to each of the Books quoted, complete a convenient handbook.

The New Testament student who has not yet discovered that series of commentaries which goes by the name of 'The Indian Church Commentaries,' should seek out the volume on *The Epistles of St. Paul the Apostle to the Colossians and to Philemon* (S.P.C.K.; 7s. 6d. net). The commentator is Walter Kelly Firminger, D.D., B.L., Archdeacon of Calcutta. Archdeacon Firminger has been given space, and he has used it to excellent purpose. The Introduction is his own, but without breaking off jauntily from Lightfoot. The Notes are explanatory, with an occasional apt and happy illustration.

A new edition has been published of *The Temptation of our Lord*, by the late H. J. C. Knight, D.D., Bishop of Gibraltar, with a portrait, and an introduction by Bishop H. H. Montgomery (S.P.C.K.; 5s. net). The chapters of the volume were delivered as the Hulsean Lectures in Cambridge in 1905-1906. St. Luke's order of temptations is followed, rightly we believe. The criticism is clear and scholarly. The loyalty is of one who has believed and has never been confounded.

The Rev. T. A. Lacey, M.A., Canon of Worcester, has edited for the S.P.C.K. 'Translations of Latin Texts' *Select Epistles of St. Cyprian*, treating of the Episcopate (8s. 6d. net). He has not

translated the letters, but has adopted and adapted the translation made in 1717 by Nathaniel Marshall. He has, however, written for this edition a long and valuable Introduction. The editor of a Dictionary of Christian Biography would have welcomed it, if he could have found space for it! The volume is one of a charming series, for which students of Church History are most grateful. It is quite worthy of a place in the series.

In *Homiletics; or, The Theory of Preaching* (Stock; 6s. net), Mr. Joseph Gowan has given fuller expression to his ideas on certain aspects of the subject than he had room for in 'Preaching and Preachers.' They are the ideas of a sympathetic hearer, critical but not captious. And if there is little that is new, there is nothing that is nasty. Mr. Gowan's chief dislike is the sensational title. He quotes two which recently appeared in a Midland city: 'How a man sinned by having his hair cut,' and 'How to stop a mad bull.' What was the text for the second?

He is severe on Macaulay for his onslaught on Montgomery's plagiarisms. 'Macaulay was not so strict on himself as on other writers; and some of his own passages are not quite free from suspicion. It is said that he was indebted to another writer for the New Zealander whom he sets on a broken arch of London Bridge to sketch the ruins of St. Paul's. And Archbishop Whately, who had none of Macaulay's bitterness, said, "Macaulay sometimes steals similes from me; but he steals like a rich man." Macaulay was no more distinguished for originality than other men; he was less distinguished than a good many; he took what it suited him to take, with quite as little compunction as others have had, and was no more anxious to acknowledge his obligations to earlier writers than other men have been.'

Two books for the use of teachers of the Bible have been issued from the Abingdon Press. One is *Hebrew Life and Times*, by Harold B. Hunting (\$1.25); the other *The Life and Times of Jesus*, by Frederick C. Grant (\$1). They seem to be both accurate; they are certainly practical. Mr. Hunting's book contains some useful illustrations of Bible trades and tools.

Surely the Bible is well taught in America. The

books for teachers that are being issued are endless, and they are all so surprisingly thorough and practical. The latest, and one of the best, is Laura A. Knott's *Student's History of the Hebrews* (Abingdon Press; \$2.90 net). The history is set out in paragraphs with black type titles, the language is carefully chosen, the questions are searching yet simple, the maps and illustrations are the latest triumph of their art.

Education in citizenship has not come yet, but it is coming. It has come in America. Important volumes are written for the teachers' instruction. There is a new volume, thoroughly scientific and thoroughly practical, written by Kenneth Colegrove, Associate Professor of Political Science in Northwestern University, entitled *American Citizens and their Government* (Abingdon Press; \$1.75 net).

No attempt is made to improve the occasion. The teacher is left to do that. Here are the facts.

One of the most delightful books about children we have ever seen is just come from the Abingdon Press. It is not a book for children. It is for their mothers. The author, Anna Frelove Betts, knows all about the ways of the little ones, and she has a convinced belief in the importance of the first few years. These are the mother's years. She would begin the education of the infant at birth. 'As soon as he is born,' are her words. For it is education in God; and she holds it to be a complete mistake to think that 'the child cannot begin to be religious until he is old enough to "say his prayers."'

The book is full of instruction, given in irresistible ways—prose, poetry, music, prayers which children pray, graces at table; pictures, plays, problems—endless enticing things. And the most enticing things of all are the full-page illustrations.

The title is *The Mother-Teacher of Religion* (\$2 net).

How fares it with our *Fundamentals of Faith in the Light of Modern Thought*? The answer is given in a hopeful, scholarly, helpful way by Horace Blake Williams (Abingdon Press; \$1.25 net). Mr. Williams is modern enough to doubt the deity of Christ; he is ancient enough to hold securely by His resurrection from the dead. And the reason is that he seems to get nothing out of the



one, much out of the other, for his own spiritual benefit and growth in grace.

He knows all about miracle. He appreciates the scientific difficulty. But: 'It cannot be too often emphasized, that to reject the resurrection of Jesus on the ground of the impossibility of miracle is to create another miracle as impossible as that which we hoped to avoid.' Yes, and more

incredible. For in physical things we cannot tell where you are; in spiritual things you can only be where there is cause and effect. 'If Jesus did not appear after His death, how are we to account for that mental state which gave birth to Christianity, and created the Christian Church and the Christian Sabbath?' 'The Christian Sabbath' is well said; it is sometimes forgotten as an item.

## The Prince of Believers.

BY THE REVEREND ARTHUR J. GOSSIP, M.A., ABERDEEN.

IF we were asked what character in the New Testament offered our Lord the most audacious faith, most of us, probably, would fix upon the penitent thief and that strange trust of his, which shone out of the midnight darkness, when faith seemed sheer unreason and mere imbecility. And yet I, for one, am not sure I would not give my vote for James. For to him it was given to believe that the child with whom he had grown up in the old nursery at home, beside whom he had learned his lessons year in and year out; with whom, as a little fellow, he had played at marriages and funerals and make-believe; often, no doubt, as a boy will, quarrelling with Him over some small trifle; with whom he had slept in the same little bed at night,—that the child who every evening knelt down with him at the same mother's knee, and day by day learned about God from the same mother's lips, was Himself the Son of God, the Word, the express image of God's person—his own old playmate, his own brother, with whom he had lived for thirty years! Even the New Testament can show no faith so strong and daring and bewildering as that.

Yet James was characteristically sane and cautious, not at all the kind of man to be swept off his feet. So cautious, indeed, that when his brother set out on His mission, James for one flatly refused to countenance Him as a prophet; would have nothing to do with Him and His claims; was not at all exultant while the people were eagerly flocking about Him, and His name was being buzzed to and fro by excited groups at every street corner; was, indeed, much ashamed of Him and His ongoings, scandalized by the

pitiful stories that came home on every wind of how He, an ignorant peasant, a mere village carpenter, dared to attack godly and learned people like the Pharisees, who had given their whole lives to religion and theology; ashamed of how He was consorting with the very scum, had sunk so low as to endeavour to buttress up His failing cause with recruits like publicans and sinners, from the contamination of whose very touch James, like all decent people, would have twitched away his garment's hem; of the blasphemous stories He kept telling, comparing the great God to the most unseemly things, until at last poor James could stand it no longer; and roundly asserting that his brother had gone off His head, actually set out to bring the poor sufferer home and shut Him up where at least He could do no further harm, and bring no more disgrace on His afflicted family. Peter and James and John might be taken in, and throw in their lot with the movement, but James held ostentatiously aloof; other poor fools might believe this was the Christ, but James was quite convinced this was no prophet, but a self-deceived impostor; no Messiah, but a lunatic! So it was to the very end. Be sure that James was in Jerusalem all those Passover days when Christ was being dragged about from one tribunal to another, and at last was led out to a felon's death; but he appears to have taken no interest in the proceedings whatsoever, simply to have gone on with his worship in the temple, praying, no doubt, with earnestness and a sore heart for his misguided and most miserable brother, the brother who for years had been the family's cross and heartbreak and disgrace.

So true is it that one can live for half a lifetime within sight of Christ and see no special beauty in Him that we should desire Him. It is, indeed, their very nearness to the Master that is most people's difficulty; because they have grown up beside Him that they so ignore and overlook Him. If we could come to the Gospels with fresh and unjaded minds, could open Luke for the first time, how it would thrill and move us to our depths—to learn that the great God loves us like that, that He is so self-sacrificing and so self-forgetful and so wholly lovable! Think what it would be to turn the leaves and come for the first time upon the Prodigal, or the Upper Room! But the old threadbare words have passed so often through our minds that we now listen to them wearily and yawningly, and with a wandering attention, as to a trite and sapless commonplace that wakens hardly any flicker of interest. If we had never had experience of God's forgiveness, and could now make proof of it for the first time, would not our lives be flooded by a sudden sunshine, and our hearts be gay as children who must dance because their happy feet will not keep still? But because we have worn a pathway to the fountain open for uncleanness, because we have received God's grace so often and so faithfully, we have largely lost sense of its marvel; can accept it nowadays with small surprise and less emotion; hardly anything of the old thrill, and little of the inspiration it once brought. At first men were dazed by it—they could not take it in, could hardly credit it, had to tell every one they met—as we all did during the war when glorious news came through. But when these excited people burst in upon us, crying, 'God loves us, has forgiven us, believes in us!' 'Of course,' we say, 'why shouldn't He? That's what He's for!' and when with hands that tremble they point to the Cross, whispering, 'Look!' 'Tut,' we reply, 'we've often seen it before!' and turn upon our heel, quite unimpressed. 'It is a great thing,' says old Halyburton, 'to receive God's pardon every time as though this were the only time we ever could receive it.' But our familiarity with it has largely deadened the Gospel's appeal, robbed it for us of half its force. It is our nearness to the Master that blinds many of us to the mystery of Jesus' person, to the wonder of His power and love. We read how Christ did marvellous works: and then how He came into His own country; and with that we draw a long breath before we turn the

page. For what will this next chapter not contain! If He wrought such extraordinary things for these aliens and strangers, what will He not do for the women whom He knew as lassies now that they were ill; for the men, who had been at school with Him, in their desperate need? 'And yet,' says a poet, thinking of how Christ's heart went out to all mankind:

And yet, I think, at Golgotha,  
As Jesus' eyes were closed in death,  
They saw with love most passionate  
The village street of Nazareth.

But when we turn the page, it is to find a blank—only these few words written, 'Here he could do no mighty works, because of their unbelief,' save that He healed a few sick folk. 'Pshaw!' they said to one another, when rumours of incredible happenings kept blowing in on every wind, 'there's nothing in it. It's just Mary's laddie who used to run my messages for me; it's just our village carpenter who mended that same chair on which you're sitting now. Miracles! not he.'

The fact of the matter is that James was the religious member of the family, or at least had the credit and the reputation of so being—James and not Jesus. A conscientious, grave, and austere man, he had devoted himself to God's service, and become a Nazirite, wore the long hair of that honourable order, practised their asceticisms and their self-denials, spent long hours a day upon his knees in prayer. The whole life of the house had to be governed largely to suit his religious habits, and no doubt this was gladly done; for every Jewish parent counted it an honour to have a Nazirite among her sons. Jesus took such food as was set before Him; but there were many things James could not touch. Jesus no doubt rose early and spent hours alone among the hills, but in the daytime He had little time for prayer, had to work hard and long to feed so many mouths; and when the evening came there were the little ones to help, and the mother to take care of in a hundred little ways that no one ever saw but He; and always there would be some child, crying and very desperate, calling for Him, with a broken toy clenched in its hot little hand for Him to mend, or some boat that would not sail aright, sure that He would not be like other grown-ups, but would see how huge was this disaster, and contrive somehow, with those clever hands of His, to put things right, and chase away the tears: or



there were tired folk to be helped, or some sick neighbour to be comforted, or some one who had fallen into sin, and with whom every one else had broken, to be sought out and cheered. His was a full day, crowded with little kindnesses; but no one appears to have thought of it as specially religious! Every one knew that where He was, there there were happiness and sunshine; every one saw that always He was thinking about others, never of Himself. But in time they just accepted that, as we all do. It was His way to be kind and unselfish; and they thought no more about it. But James was always at his prayers, and always at his fasts, and always at his religious exercises, till the very bairns, who hailed his Elder Brother with shouts of delight and came tumbling to meet Him, grew hushed and awed and awkward in presence of the spare, ascetic, other-worldly saint, whom every one could see was a saint.

Long years after, looking back, James spoke with a certain bitterness and fierceness of these things, warned others that to fast and pray and busy oneself in religious ordinances is an empty thing unless it is having effect upon our character and daily life.

These things, he says, are not religion; but simply the means whereby we may attain to it; the fuel with which it is fed: and the thing itself is to be kind of heart, and free from selfishness, to think of others, and to spend oneself for others; to make the world a brighter place by lifting burdens from tired shoulders, and sharing the sorrows of sad hearts, and helping those who have no claim on us, except that they are needy and that we have help to give. It is not difficult to understand what face had risen up before him when he defines religion as a great unselfishness and a compassion and a giving of oneself away with both full, generous hands. Is your faith bearing fruit like that? he cries, in his own pointed way. Are your prayers teaching you to gain the Christlike mind? Because religion, as I saw the Master live it out, was a most practical and homely thing. I wonder have we learned that, you and I? Some people never do, go to their death with eyes unopened. Ruskin has a very scornful passage on our phrase 'divine services'; telling us that, while it is right and fitting that a child should ask its father for what it would like, and thank him for what he has given, no child would call that serving him! Yet that is what God's children term it—

that is all the service many of them ever give! Without prayer we can never keep the Christlike mind alive; the thing cannot be done. But prayer and church attendance and the like are not religion, far less Christlikeness. For that is to be self-denying, to forget oneself, to think of others, to refuse to shut oneself within one's narrow interests, to make our aim not how much we can get, but how much we can do, and all this in the little nothings that make up our daily round.

Although James had no faith in his brother, Christ believed in James; and probably few nails in the Cross He had to carry hurt Him more than that He Himself had so to vex and wound His brother's heart. Apart from natural affection, there was a sincerity, an earnestness, a sterling worth in him that called out Christ's regard. Of him, too, surely it might have been written, as of that other not dissimilar soul, that Jesus beholding him loved him, with a frank, admiring love that showed plainly in His eyes. And accordingly one of the first of those to whom He appeared after His resurrection was His own oldest brother.

What these two said to one another in that unimaginable interview, the Scriptures, with their innate delicacy, give no hint. 'A word did it,' Savonarola used to say, speaking of his altered character and life, 'a word did it'; but he never told the word. No more did James drop any hint; only, like Saul on the Damascus road, he too saw and believed.

High things were spoken there, unhanded down;  
Only they saw thee from the secret shrine  
Returning with hot cheeks and kindled eyes.

How many of us, stubborn in our unbelief, or careless and indifferent, have been so suddenly arrested, found ourselves face to face with Christ, this Master whom we had ignored, if not disliked; and all at once we saw. Just how it came about we do not perhaps know, and could not perhaps tell. Only what had been blank to us grew full of meaning; what had seemed utterly impossible was seen to be the most sure and most glorious fact; what had been nothing, everything. 'James, the slave of Jesus Christ,' is how he opens his Epistle.

Of James' service to the Church it were not easy to speak too much or too highly. Even apart from his relationship to the Master, his own great gifts of mind, and purity of soul, and saintliness of

character, marked him out as a leader even in the circle of the first disciples. And to him there was given a post than which none was more dangerous or delicate or difficult to fill. For nowhere was the Church more vexed and harried than at its headquarters in Jerusalem, and yet it was here, on the scene of his Master's martyrdom, among the very men who had contrived it, that he chose to serve and bear his witness. When the persecution broke out, nearly all the others scattered, bearing the gospel north and south and east and west; but James' heart clung to Jerusalem; and he seems to have faced the danger and stayed on. A less wise or conciliatory leader, or one less sympathetic to the old religion, would have been hurried to an early death. But, so old Hegesippus tells us, James' austere saintliness won reverence even from the Jews—this man who prayed so much for the people in the temple that his knees became hard as a camel's; whom almost alone among the Christians, Jews could understand, and did admire.

Nor was that all. For what particularly strikes one in time is his open-mindedness, which, contrary to the normal course, grew with the years, not lessened. All James' instincts were conservative and cautious; the whole turn of his mind was such that naturally he would have been narrow and prejudiced and even bigoted. Left to himself, he would never have gone to the Gentiles; and when tidings that Peter and then Paul had done so reached him, he felt that things were not going his way, nor as he would have chosen. Yet when the clamour grew, and the orthodox folk appealed to him, sure of a favourable ruling, though he knew that it meant endless trouble to himself, the man did violence to the bias of his nature and the set of his mind, and boldly threw his influence into the scale for liberty of action. It is not my way, he said; and I myself could not have done it. But God seems to have spoken, and revealed that they are right, not I; that what I imagined to be principle was merely private prejudice, and now that He has taught me, I dare not oppose His will. And it was largely James' tact and conciliatoriness and humility that held the Church together, and saved it from disruption into half a dozen warring sects.

All which is evidence of real greatness of soul. It is so easy to sulk and be stubborn when things will not go our way, to elevate our likings and

our prejudices into principles; so hard to give way gracefully and heartily, to welcome new truth, when we see that it is truth, though not what we hoped and believed would prove truth, but the opposite. A soul that keeps its windows open to the light and air, that is willing to listen when God speaks to it, that is prepared to follow truth wherever it may lead, is one with which God can do anything. But most of us are thrwn and dogged, hold to our views of things just because they are ours, do not want further light—will not admit that it is light, insist that the accustomed is the real, and are sadly inhospitable to the unfamiliar. For no gift should we pray God oftener than for openness of mind, especially in these times of transition, when everything, thrown back into the crucible, is emerging in new forms—most of all if we are growing old. For ageing minds, like ageing limbs, grow stiff and inelastic, find it increasingly difficult to twist themselves to the new point of view, and increasingly easy to dismiss the novel as mere decadence and heresy, although sometimes it is God's voice they are resisting. It was not easy for James, yet he did it. There are people to whom certain of the virtues seem to come by nature, and others for whom they are desperately hard. And it is they who, doing violence to their natural disposition, gain what was none of theirs who are the greatest saints. As Newman says, it is not the ninety-nine points where it is easy, but the one where it is hard, that is the test.

And what makes James' triumph more remarkable is that he was both a passionate and a quick-tongued man. No one can read his Epistle without learning that; without discovering where his shoe pinched and his soul bled. Again and again he returns to it with shame and self-loathing, heaping up dreadful words of shuddering and disgust. The very snakes can be robbed of their fangs and venom, but the tongue can no man tame; and there are years of struggle and of failure in that bitter cry. Do what we will, it masters us, breaks through our guard, hurries us where we had not meant to go, into hot angry words, and bitterness of judgment; into a deadly poison of detraction; into talking about others, meaning indeed no harm, and yet none the less doing it; hinting faults, passing on what we have heard without the slightest knowledge or the least investigation, wounding others' reputation merely to give a fillip to a conversation, or revive it when it



drags. It is the very fire of hell, cries James, aflame in our own nature: and as he cries the man tears at the Nessus shirt that stings and burns him, yet which he cannot get off. It is what makes hell hell, and it is ablaze in us, and will not be trampled out; leaps into flame, tread desperately on it how we will. All which seems unreal and exaggerated to us, who keep stumbling half a dozen times a day into such sins, and think no more about them, never remember our hot words or our idle chatter about other folk, account these very little faults hardly worth chronicling. And yet, as James looks back, the thing about Christ that appears to have remained most vividly with him, the characteristic that bewildered him the most, was just His perfect mastery of His tongue. Often as James as man and boy had been irritating, often as he had spoken woundingly, often as he had misjudged and misunderstood Him, never once had Jesus been betrayed into passion or ill-humour or one unguarded word. That seems to have been the element in His perfection that haunted James, and humbled him, and stirred him to a wondering envy. If any man seemeth to be religious and bridled not his tongue, he has but small resemblance to the Master as I saw Him.

Well, we have a great fight before us! Yet, as we enter it, let us catch something of James' intrepidity and sheer gallantry of spirit. There never was a finer spiritual fighter, one with steadier eyes, and a heart less afraid. When a temptation leaps at us we, for the most part, whimper and snivel and pity ourselves, go into action whipt before the issue is joined. But not so James, who exults in battle—'Count it all joy,' he says—hails a temptation from afar as a new opportunity of victory, another field where freedom can be won and shrewd blows struck, defines it as a chance, not of sinning, as we do, but of winning.

One who never turned his back but marched breast forward,  
Never doubted clouds would break,  
Never dreamed, though right were worsted, wrong would triumph,

Held we fall to rise, are baffled to fight better,  
Sleep to wake.

The soul that faces what life sends so gallantly and with such utter faith cannot be vanquished. Could we but gain the spirit of this doughty fighter, we too would pass on from strength to strength, from one impossible triumph to another and yet greater, would really find that all things work together for our good.

## In the Study.

### *Virginitus Puerisque.*

#### No Excuse!

'They all with one consent began to make excuse.'—  
Lk 14<sup>18</sup>.

IF I were to ask the boys and girls who had never made an excuse to hold up their hands, I wonder how many hands we should see? I should not be surprised to see no hands at all. Certainly nobody would see my hand.

Making excuses is one of the commonest habits and one of the silliest. Very few people wish to hear excuses. They can't be bothered with them. And yet we go on bothering others to listen to them and bothering ourselves to make them. About the one time when an excuse is excusable is when we are likely to be gravely misjudged or misunderstood on account of some big thing of which we are entirely innocent. As for the little

things we get blamed for in everyday life, it is better just to bear the blame and say nothing, rather than get into a habit of excusing and explaining. Perhaps you will think that sounds rather hard, but every sensible boy and girl knows these little hardships are the things that make men and women of us.

Have you ever met a person you could never put in the wrong? They had an excuse for everything. Other people might be wrong, but *they* were right. They had knocked a cup off a shelf and broken it. Oh yes, but some one else had placed the cup on the edge of the shelf, otherwise it would never have been broken! They had lost their temper hopelessly, and scratched their small sister's face. Yes, but the small sister was so provoking! They had told a lie. Well, no, they hadn't exactly, they just didn't understand what you meant. Aren't people like that annoying,

and don't you want to give them a good shaking?

Now, there are two kinds of excuses big and little people make—the excuses for *having* done something they *ought not* to have done, and the excuses for *not having* done something they *ought* to have done.

1. First we shall take the *excuses for having done something we ought not to have done.*

There are several varieties of this kind, and the first variety is that which puts the blame on persons. I'm not going to say very much about this variety, because most boys and girls are above that sort of thing—all honour to them! They would rather bear the blame themselves than get another boy or girl into a row.

But while few of us would descend to blaming a particular friend, a good many of us are not ashamed to accuse our friends in general. If we have done something wrong, it somehow doesn't seem quite so bad if other people have shared in the wrong-doing. But remember—'Other fellows do it' is no excuse. It doesn't take a bit of the blame off you. It just shows your weakness. If you know a thing to be wrong, it doesn't become any less wrong because 'other fellows do it.'

The second variety of the 'having done something we ought not' excuse is the variety which puts the blame on things. Mary was playing with a valuable drawing-room ornament and dropped it so that it smashed in bits; but it wasn't she who dropped it, it was the silly ornament that fell out of her hand.

Jack and Margaret were late for school this morning. Margaret took forty extra winks, and Jack loitered by the way to watch a performing monkey, and superintend an excavation in the road. But the dining-room clock got blamed by both. Poor, dear clocks! Aren't you sorry for them, and aren't you glad they haven't any feelings? They get such a lot of blame they don't deserve!

Such excuses remind me of a story I read not long ago. In a certain office in a large city it was the custom for the clerks who were late to write down the reason for their want of punctuality. If there was a fog, the first clerk who came in late would write 'Fog,' and all the clerks who followed would write 'Ditto.' One morning the first clerk wrote as his excuse—'Sudden illness of my mother,'

and all the other clerks, without reading, wrote 'Ditto.'

Then there is the excuse which says 'I didn't think,' or 'I didn't know,' or 'I didn't understand.' We seem to have the idea that because we 'didn't think,' or 'didn't know,' or 'didn't understand,' therefore we are quite free from blame. Do you know, I think I should be rather ashamed to make an excuse like that. It is giving oneself away dreadfully. It is showing that that is just where we *were* to blame. We are all given a certain amount of common sense, and it is our business to use it. And if we don't use it, both we ourselves and those around us are bound to suffer. Remember that—

Evil is wrought by want of thought  
As well as want of heart.

2. But there is the other kind of excuse altogether—the *excuse for not having done what we ought to have done.*

What is it we omit to do? Is it some little everyday duty? Is it some act of kindness that will cost us a little trouble or bring ridicule upon us? We are lazy, or selfish, or afraid of being laughed at, but we excuse ourselves by saying that it is not our business, or that other people could do it better. Boys and girls, if the duty or the kindness is there for us to do, then *we* are the very best people, and the only people, to do it.

There is one very big thing that many, many people omit to do—to come to Jesus when He calls them. And there is nothing in this world about which people make more excuses.

Do you remember the story from which our text was taken? It is the story of a man who made a great supper. And when all things were ready, he sent his servant to summon those who had already been invited. 'And they all with one consent began to make excuse.' One had bought some land: he wished to go and see it. But the land would not have run away whilst he was at supper. A second had bought a yoke of oxen: he desired to test them. But, having purchased the oxen, he could easily have waited to prove them. A third had just married a wife. Could he not have brought her with him? If that were impossible, could he not have left her for a few hours, when they were to spend all their lives together? The truth was the men did not *want* to come.

Don't you think they were rather stupid? If



you were invited to a very, very nice supper-party, wouldn't you like to go to it?

And yet Jesus has spread a splendid feast for us all—the feast of His grace and love—a far better feast than any earthly one; and we are so stupid and so ungrateful, that we invent all kinds of excuses why we should not come to it. The chief excuse with young people is that they are too young. They will think about it later. No one was ever too young to come to Jesus. He called the little children to Him, and He calls them still.

#### A Chat about the Clock.

You may have heard people speak of a clock as a good one, but do you know what clock-goodness is? The two things are not quite the same.

Of course, a clock has a nice clean face, but then yours is always clean, even though it is not kept under a glass like the clock's. The clock goes on with its work whether any one is looking or not, but you never want watching, for you always get your lessons done, and you have never to be reminded to do what mother told you. The clock keeps its hands out of mischief, and it never strikes any one. Even when it strikes the hour, the hands do not do the striking. But I can tell you what they do. They are very wonderful hands, for they can teach us what clock-goodness means.

The hands teach us good behaviour: Twice in every twenty-four hours, the hands point straight up and down. That means 6 o'clock, but it means something else. Can you guess what? Straight up and down means we must be upright in conduct; down-right in duty. We must strive to do the right, and we must do it with our might. Being down-right in duty means working hard at our lessons and never complaining when we have to do something that is hard or unpleasant. But there! You are always like the clock in that!

Those hands teach us to pray, for at the beginning of each day, say one minute past 12 a.m., again at 12 noon, and again at 12 midnight, the clock puts its hands together before its face just like a child saying its prayers. Is that too often? No one says his prayers in the middle of the day? Well, you will find that one brave man used to pray three times every day, although the king had forbidden it altogether. His name was Daniel.

Here is just another thing. They teach us how

to be helpful. Twice every twelve hours—at 9.15 and 2.45, you see them stretched out as though they were saying, 'Here are two hands willing to do any good we can. We are ready to carry or lift, ready to do a little kindness for any one, ready for any duty the day may bring!' And this is the readiness that pleases mother so much. How delighted she would be if you really tried to help her—and did it willingly, too! Just fancy how she would feel if you were to go to her before you went out for that game of which you are so fond and said, 'Is there anything you want me to do before I go?' What a light would come into her face!

It is worth trying to be as good as the clock! And you can easily remember what the clock says, for it is—

Hands up and down . . .	RIGHTEOUSNESS
Hands together . . .	REVERENCE
Hands open wide . . .	READINESS

And as you are now getting big, you will know that just as the hands of the clock depend on what is going on behind the face, so our hands move according to the heart. 'Keep thy heart with all diligence, for out of it are the issues of life.'<sup>1</sup>

#### The Christian Year.

##### FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

##### The Lord of the Ages.

'He is risen from the dead.'—Mt 28<sup>7</sup>.

Faith in the risen Lord does not rest upon the resurrection as an historical fact. It rests upon the existence of a world of love and grace in the midst of which we live and for which we must provide an adequate source. The manner of the resurrection is secondary. What we need to know is that the Lord is with us, leading the forces of civilization, and that He will be with us to the end. Of this fact the resurrection is the assurance; of the resurrection this fact is the evidence. The resurrection of Jesus is the point of transition, where He who was a single figure in history becomes the Lord of the ages.

1. For two thousand years He who was dead has been leading the forces of civilization. When they have halted, His word of command has been

<sup>1</sup> J. W. G. Ward, *Parables for Little People*.

heard; when they have wavered, His hand has led them back. This statement is writ so large that it scarcely requires evidence to support it. Take our conception of time. Of old there was no universal time-measure. Early peoples dated events by the foundation of their city or the reign of their king. But Jesus stamped His name upon the calendar of the civilized world. He began a new era, alive with meanings drawing their inspiration from Him. Here was furnished a point of time about which might be assembled the facts of history. From henceforth time was divided into divisions—before Christ and after Christ. There was one event that stood in such vital relation to all history that all before it was preparation and all after it result. And to-day business and politics, legislation and literature, are all adjusted to the chronology of Jesus.

How does this come about? How is it that a native of a subject province, a Man who during His lifetime exerted a narrow influence, who was cast out by His own people and died a criminal's death, has written His name across the face of human history? He was a great teacher, but the world had had great teachers. He died as a martyr, but in this He was not alone. The answer is to be found in the fact that He who died is still in the midst of His people, directing the forces of life into new channels. He is risen from the dead, and goes before you. Whatever we may think of the event in Joseph's tomb, Jesus has been living in the life of the centuries, a spiritual fact working in the midst of men from out the unseen world. Despite continued opposition, His spirit has taken hold of the life of the race; it has awakened, inspired, and instructed that life, and lifted it up toward better things.

'But,' you will say, 'this does not argue that Jesus rose from the dead. Other men, about whom no such claim has been made, have left an abiding influence behind. Plato lives and Cæsar lives.' You miss the point. The civilization to which we refer has not drawn its life from the personal influence of Jesus as transmitted through His words, but from the conviction that He is alive and in the midst of His people. This was the dynamic that impelled the early messengers of the cross, that made them equal to any task. This is still the motive power of all Christian endeavour. 'Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.' Plato could create a school; Jesus created a civilization. Plato's influence was a memory; Jesus' influence

has always been a presence. The belief in a living Christ has been the sustaining power of the Christian believer. It has inspired in the missionary that spirit of personal abandon necessary to the spread of the gospel in the land of danger. It has begotten a confidence that has lived and laboured in times of failure and defeat. The Christian has not only found instruction in Jesus' words, and direction in His example, but he has been sustained, day by day, amid the toils and dangers, the temptations and losses of life, by the sense of an abiding Presence.

2. He goes before you to-day. You may not call yourself a Christian man, you may not belong to the Christian Church; but tell me, where do you get your ideals of right, the ambition you have to do good and to make humanity better?

What is the intelligent motive of effort in behalf of the common good and the increase of happiness to-day? What incentive lies at the back of our world of philanthropy? The desire to make the conditions of life more favourable. But is this desire sufficient to create a civilization that has as its aim to banish disease and lengthen life, to lessen trouble and lighten toil, unless it have back of it a supreme sense of the value of human life? Our civilization, comprising its manifold agencies for enhancing the meaning of man's existence, was born of an awakened sense of the value of the human personality. And whence came this sense of value? Human life, though endowed with its loves and hopes and aims, is an empty thing if these are shut within the limits of the world of flesh.

Any object acquires its value from its destiny. Things of little worth become worthful when they are made subservient to a worthy end. A block of refuse marble, outside the gates of Rome, becomes a treasure of art, when chosen by Michael Angelo as the instrument of his genius. Even so the human personality, valueless as a thing of time, gains merit when its destiny is revealed. Man, as a child of eternity, rises above the ills and hurts of time. His life wins an end within itself, and henceforth the aim of human endeavour is to employ the things of time so far as they are helpful, to eliminate them so far as they are a hinderance, to the attainment of that end.

The resurrection of Jesus brought to the world a revelation of the destiny of human life. In the presence of the risen Lord belief in the eternity of the soul was born, and with that belief a civilization



that seeks, through education, philanthropy, and the mastery of nature, the fulfilment of that destiny. And every man to-day who believes in education, science, and charity, and works for the betterment of human conditions, lives under the inspiration of a conception of life that was born of the broken tomb.

It is no mere accident that Christianity is the only type of civilization that has made for true enlightenment and for progress. Every other civilization has lacked the incentive to progress, because it has failed of its conception of the destiny of man. Christianity alone possesses the energy for advancement, for it alone reveals what man is to be and imparts the power to realize that end. The religion of Jesus, unlike other religions, calls a man, not to the performance of acts and ceremonies, but simply to the task of self-realization. Its very motive is development. But that motive would be powerless, were it not for two facts: that in the person of Jesus is given a demonstration of the possibility of life, and that the risen Lord has impressed upon the world a belief in the eternity of life. Under the inspiration of these two facts Christianity has become a power that has made for the emancipation and elevation of the human person and the awakening of the higher energies of man's nature. It has filled the heart of the world with a hope that has created new views of what man is to be and new agencies for the realization of that being.

3. He goes before you for the days that are to come. Humanity marches into the future under the inspiration of a dual hope, that the race will attain to a new world, that the individual will attain to a new life. This twofold hope was born of the resurrection of Jesus.

When the Great War began, and the ear of the world was filled with stories of the barbarities of cultivated nations, men of little faith complained, 'Christianity has failed.' This complaint was an unintended tribute to the power of Christianity. Why, Christianity has failed? Why not, education has failed, science has failed, humanity has failed? No, we have considered humanity a failure, and have not hoped greatly that science or education could redeem it. But we have believed that Christianity was accomplishing, and would ultimately accomplish its redemption. And why Christianity? It has given to the world the ideal of a new age, but this has not been the dynamic of the future hope

of the generations. Plato gave in his *Republic* a vision of what mankind ought to be. The dynamic of the world's faith for the future has rested in those words appended to the Great Commission, 'Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.' Humanity has accepted the challenge of Jesus to bring in the future kingdom, because it has believed that He was present, working with it, and that in that presence resides a power that makes the impossible attainable. That belief was born of the word of a risen Lord.

Sin is the world's great problem. The hope of the future lies in breaking the power of sin. The bringing in of a new age is not primarily a matter of legislation, nor of education, but of regeneration. So long as sin remains, man's happiness is marred, and his possibilities destroyed, no matter what other gains are made. Therefore, from the beginning, humanity has looked for one who could save from sin. This Jesus claimed to do not merely by reason of His own example, but through His ability to bring into life a saving power. Belief in that power, and therefore the hope of a new age, was born on the day of the resurrection. For two thousand years the Christian army has been marching toward the future, labouring and praying for the coming in of that age. If Jesus is no Saviour, if the rock of belief in His Saviourhood is removed, all the worse for the world. Its hope of a redeemed humanity is gone. But while unbelief complains, millions in whose lives the reign of sin has been broken rise up to reaffirm their hope of a new world because of their experience of the power of a present Lord.

Furthermore, He goes before you into the valley of death. Life for each of us is filled with uncertainty, but in nothing is that uncertainty greater than in the event of death. Death is the great omnipotent fact, with which every one must reckon, yet about it we know nothing, except that it will come. The when, the how, the where are hidden from us. To-day the babe is snatched from its mother's arms, to-morrow the youth is taken in his strength, or the wife and mother in her womanhood. If we could only 'wrap the drapery of our couch about us and lie down to pleasant dreams,' but we cannot. No ministry that can come to human life can contribute more greatly to man's contentment and ambition than that which can create the belief that death is not an enemy but a friend. This the resurrection of Jesus has done. It has put in place of the grave the sun-lit splendour of the New Jeru-

salem. It has filled human hearts with a glad ambition to make the most of themselves and of their time here, not because death is the end, but because it is the true beginning.

Then let us rejoice in a risen Lord whose presence is certified, not by extraneous evidence, but by a world of life and love and hope, which bears witness to Him every day.<sup>1</sup>

The Lord is risen indeed.

He is here for your love, for your need—

Not in the grave, nor the sky,

But here where men live and die;

And true the word that was said:

'Why seek ye the living among the dead?'

Wherever are tears and sighs,

Wherever are children's eyes,

Where man calls man his brother,

And loves as himself another,

Christ lives! The angels said:

'Why seek ye the living among the dead?''<sup>2</sup>

#### SUNDAY AFTER ASCENSION DAY.

##### Redemption from Fear.

'Fear him, which after he hath killed hath power to cast into Gehenna,'—Lk 12<sup>5</sup>.

1. The characteristic of practically all primitive religions is *fear*. That was true, so far as we can discover, of all ancient primitive forms of belief; it is certainly true of all primitive forms to-day. Man is at the mercy of unseen personalities of unknown power. He first becomes 'conscious of these personalities as he begins to seek for causes to explain the happenings of his life or the conditions by which he is surrounded. In the earliest stages of belief these personalities are almost always malignant and must be propitiated—that is to say that at first it is the evil happenings which most impress him. His first impulse is to give his gods something—to bribe them by sacrifice into at least benevolent neutrality if not into active co-operation on his behalf. It is not till a much later stage in his development that any ethical conception begins to appear.

On the other hand, the record of revelation and of development contained in the Old Testament

<sup>1</sup> H. B. Williams, *Fundamentals of Faith in the Light of Modern Thought*.

<sup>2</sup> Richard Watson Gilder, 'Easter.'

is full of the idea of conflict. Man is no longer merely the sport of unknown powers. He is conscious of himself and slowly becomes conscious that he can and must fight against evil. All the fervour and wrath of the prophets is stirred when men turn back to the old ideas and begin again to try to propitiate their strange gods. It is treachery against Jehovah, but it is treachery too of man against himself.

And Christian consciousness is quite clear about the fact of conflict. It is part of the education or growth of the spirit to become more sensitive to the fact. But in that growth or education what place are we to assign to this ancient consciousness of hostile spiritual forces actively at work, actively engaged in an attempt to injure or even to destroy that inner spiritual life by which man is conscious of God and of his own high destiny?

(1) Two factors must be noted in passing which do not tend to make our task easier. One is the deep-seated idea that in the process of mental and moral evolution we have reached a stage which warrants us (if indeed it does not insist) in discarding primitive beliefs as definitely belonging only to the earlier stages of man's development and definitely to be discarded by more enlightened folk. At one end of the scale are the affirmations of animism, at the other the negations of such systems of belief as Christian Science. But the persistence in one form or another of the belief in spirits would seem to challenge the validity of this idea as a sound canon of progress.

(2) The other factor to be borne in mind is the theological colour which Western Christianity has given to Omnipotence as an attribute of Deity, a colour which makes it difficult for us to realize any kind of limitation to Divine power or to make room in our thought for any other personalities besides the Deity and ourselves. It is due to this attitude that any discussion of our subject has for long been ruled out of court. Science has been called in to supplement by her doctrine of natural laws the defects of theological discussion. But the newer philosophy of vitalism has shown that natural laws are not the whole account of the matter—that there is a *causa causans* which has still to be taken into account, and this has directed our thought towards new ideas of personal and spiritual elements in the development of human nature. And, theologically, there has been a welcome movement towards re-examining our con-



ceptions of the attributes of Deity in the light of the broader *παντοκράτωρ* of the Nicene Creed rather than of the narrower and less adequate Omnipotens of the Western Creeds.

2. So far as the ancient Hebrews are concerned, their thoughts about the world of spirits were largely moulded by the early Semitic ideas which surrounded them in the dawn of their history. They come perhaps through the stream of polytheism, but they have deeper roots than that in primitive animism. And even at that earlier stage in his development man was seeking for causes of the phenomena of nature or of personal experience. He lived in a world peopled with superhuman agencies, some beneficent, others (and more of them) malignant. The strongest influences from outside on Hebrew thought came from Babylon. There are three strange passages in the Old Testament where this influence can clearly be seen: Is 34<sup>14</sup> (? not later than the Exile), 'the hairy satyr shall cry to his fellow, the screech-owl (=night monster) shall rest there.' Lv 17<sup>7</sup>, 'no more offer sacrifices unto devils' (satyrs; post-exilic). Best known of all is the 'scapegoat' of Lv 16<sup>8, 10, 26</sup> = Azazel (marg.). Azazel is not elsewhere mentioned in the Old Testament, but the Book of Enoch (second century B.C.) speaks of Azazel as leader of the evil spirits.

It is to be noted that the creation of the angels is not mentioned in the Old Testament. Like the existence of God, their existence is presupposed. In He 1<sup>14</sup> they are called 'spirits,' but not in the Old Testament, where not even God is yet called Spirit. They belong to Jehovah's retinue, they are an element of His majesty, but it is not till later ages that their relation to man gains real definiteness. Generally in the Old Testament 'angel of the Lord' is a theophany, though sometimes, as in Gn 16<sup>11</sup> 32<sup>24</sup> 33<sup>2</sup> (but interpreted in 33<sup>14, 15</sup>), a distinction appears. It is when Greek influence makes itself felt that angels become intermediate agencies between the absolute transcendent God and the world of men.

3. The Old Testament is as much a record of the education of man's spiritual faculties and perceptions as of the actual content of revelation. In the New Testament we enter a new atmosphere. It is specifically the record of *redemptive* history, the final emancipation from the religion of fear. We see at last in clear light not only what God's purpose for man is, and what His work; we are

taught not only to realize and explore the relation in which man actually stands to God—'God so loved the world,' but, too, we are taught something of the character of that conflict which God wages on man's behalf. We leave the atmosphere of primitive ideas, the influence of animism, Semitism, of Babylon, Persia, Greece. They have had their place in the education of the religious sense, they have helped to mould man's conception of the spiritual world. They have contributed much towards his understanding of the universe and of his relation to it. But their chief work has been educative, formative, preparatory. In the New Testament we are in presence of the great central Fact of human history, and in the light of that Fact we gain new understanding. The Incarnation shows God interpreting Himself in terms of human life—but it also shows God interpreting human life and all that touches it in terms of Divine knowledge and Divine purpose. And apart from the last and most terrible conflict with evil on the Cross, we can see coming athwart that Life of serene strength and clear vision a growing knowledge that that serenity and clearness involves issues with a hostile and malignant power which is something vastly more and vastly stronger than moral depravity in man. There are some instances in the Gospels where our Lord's consciousness of contact with an evil personality or power seems to be clear and outstanding.

(1) *The Temptation*.—The form of the story is, for our present purpose, immaterial; we are more concerned with the fact that 'the ultimate source of information must have been our Lord Himself, as the most vigorous criticism admits.' We may then believe that the account was given as part of the whole revelation of spiritual fact which it was our Lord's mission to give to men. And the outstanding fact of the Temptation was that of conflict. While 'the meaning and essence of the Temptation is wholly spiritual; it is the problem of what is to be done with supernatural powers: shall the possessor of them use them for his own sustenance or for his own aggrandisement?' the *source* of the Temptation must be recognized as lying outside our Lord's personality. It is unthinkable to ascribe the Temptation to anything approaching 'moral turpitude' in the Incarnate God. It is equally unthinkable that the Father should be the source of any such testing for the Son. There remains only this: that the source of the Temptation lay

in that evil personality whose hold on human nature it was the Son's purpose to subdue, and both the Father and the Son refused to evade contact with that evil personality which was the common lot of that humanity with which the Son had clothed Himself.

If this is the right point of view from which to regard the Temptation, it will fall into place not merely as a preliminary to our Lord's teaching with regard to the evil that is in man, but also with His attitude towards the evil which is 'outside' of man and of which he is the victim, not only in his moral, but in his physical being.

(2) When, for the first time, He has called His followers to His help in liberating their fellows from bondage, and they report that even the devils (*τὰ δαιμόνια*) (Lk 10<sup>17</sup>) are subject unto them in His Name, there comes that strange comment: 'I beheld Satan fallen as lightning from heaven . . . howbeit, rejoice not that the spirits (*τὰ πνεύματα*) are subject unto you. . . .' Is there not a sense of personal conflict between God at work in men and through men and an evil power holding men in thrall? Nor can we fail to notice that in the commission given to these seventy men there is given unmistakable evidence of the presence of this hostile power in the 'serpents and scorpions' on which they had been given authority to tread. It would seem that these poisonous creatures, hostile to man, were in some mysterious way a manifestation of the 'power of the enemy,' and that the coming of the Incarnate Power ultimately involved their subjugation or even their destruction. Mark has already hinted that they were powerless in His Presence.

(3) Or in that scene where the Lord reveals so much of the spiritual conflict of His life (Lk 22<sup>28ff.</sup>): 'Ye are they that have been with me in my temptations'; and He adds, addressing that disciple so fervent in emotional love, so lacking in perception of spiritual danger, 'Simon, Simon, Satan asked to have you (pl.) . . . but I made supplication for thee that thy faith fail not; and do thou when once thou hast turned again establish thy brethren.'

(4) Or, once more, in Gethsemane: 'This is your hour and the power of darkness.'

All of it speaks of the personal contact of the Lord of Life with a supernatural power of evil from whose grip He has come to deliver His brethren. In St. John this note is specially strong and clear.

Thus 12<sup>31</sup>, 'Now shall the prince of this world be cast out'; 14<sup>30</sup>, 'The prince of this world cometh and hath nothing in me' ('nothing that falls under his power,' Westcott, *in loc.*); 16<sup>11</sup>, 'The prince of this world is judged.' We note the likeness between these passages in St. John and Eph 2<sup>2</sup> 6<sup>12</sup>. The whole tone of them is in complete contrast to the received ideas of our Lord's time. There the devil is represented as the enemy of man rather than of God. Here it is a direct conflict waged by God to conquer the enemy of good, to recover the Kingdom, and therefore to set men free from thralldom.

Does it mean that those ancient intuitions, those dim fears of bygone ages, have been groundless, imaginary, false, or does it mean that, like law the schoolmaster, they were meant to lead to the great Healer and Conqueror, the Christ of God? For it is to be remarked with special care that while our Lord completely contradicts the primitive false notions of God as a tyrant who rules in blood, He as distinctly seems to emphasize and reaffirm the truth of those primitive convictions which personified evil and gave that personified power a large share in the happenings of human life. St. Lk 12<sup>5</sup> is His most impressive warning: 'Fear him who after he hath killed hath power (*ἐξουσίαν*) to cast into Gehenna.' And it is in absolute contrast to His teaching about the Father's thought of men which comes in the immediate context, 'Fear not, ye are of more value than many sparrows.'<sup>1</sup>

#### WHITSUNDAY.

#### Temptation.

'Tempted.'—Lk 4<sup>2</sup>.

1. Temptation or probation appears to be not an occasional but an integral and inseparable element in human action. It is the struggle experienced in acting fully up to our make, the painful struggle to be loyal to what we know to be best. In our action as purposeful, reasoning, moral, and responsible we seek ends and means which we fully approve. In the choice of means, when once an end is fixed, there is a process of narrowing of option enforced by our knowledge of the end, of laws and conditions which rule our choice, and of the conduciveness of means considered. Because we are reasoning and moral, our make forces us—

<sup>1</sup> J. R. Pridie, *The Spiritual Gifts*.



if we are completely loyal to it—to choose the best means. When the process converges on the means so approved, our self-committal to our end enforces our adoption of that means and no other; what is best becomes for us the sole means open to us. The earlier stages may be comparatively rapid and easy. The intensity of the struggle increases as the range of option is narrowed, when the persistent sifting of means at last drives us to pass judgment on the most desirable of the *rejicienda* and reject it.

(1) The issues of such action through struggle are manifold. The agent himself is profoundly affected. His qualities thus brought into play are strengthened or weakened for future action according as they are exercised or repressed. To have been true to what is acknowledged *in foro conscientie* as the highest is the pledge and the strength of being so again. Courage and discrimination are developed. Principles to which appeal is made as embodying the best, if bowed to, receive an enhanced, a more binding authority; they remain to rule. The discerning of an effective means and the sanctioning of it at real cost, confirm the agent in loyalty to his end; his persistence in pursuing it is more assured. Common experience illustrates the fact that steadfastness in adherence to both an end and an adopted means depends largely on the agony through which both have been determined.

(2) But the moral effect on the agent, great as it is, is not the whole issue of such struggle. The action—the use of the means and the attainment of the end—must not be lost sight of. It is an issue that enables us to judge clearly both an end and a means determined on. Often an agent himself can only long after the struggle articulately express what his decisions have been; and still more often to others it is the sequel alone which interprets the crisis, and reveals the choice made.

Thus a temptation can never be divorced from the course of a life. It is woven into the very texture of life's continuity. It is a temptation because we are what we are *at the time*. It is the conditions of the crisis which make a moment, a decision critical; mature years, with the mature ends and character which they bring, make what would be a sore temptation to youth, free from real agony. It is thus the whole setting of a life which brings temptation. So temptation is never clean detached from the past or the future of the

tempted; for there is no such thing as a human experience which has not its roots in the past and its fruit in the sequel. Nor does temptation come to men sitting absolutely still, vacuous or inert: it is the experience of an agent. For by our make we act towards ends by means, and we reason and act as moral and responsible; and while all such action involves temptation, so conversely all conception of temptation involves such action. It follows that, for a really adequate knowledge of a temptation, insight into the whole life, and particularly into its immediate conditions, is indispensable. The whole setting must be known—the framework—for a true interpretation of such a crisis.

2. In the many narratives of temptations in Scripture the interpretative element is predominant. Temptation is in Scripture a religious term; the tempted is viewed as related to God; and his experience is interpreted rather than merely analysed or described. Human knowledge of the highest, either in ends or means, is interpreted as being the voice of God in or to us. The laws which rule action are interpreted as expressions of His will. To obey Him: to disregard them is interpreted as defiance of Him and as obedience to Satan, for that which is lower than the highest is interpreted as the will set against God. In these narratives the issue, as interpreted in them, is usually the effect left on the tempted—his tried virtue or purification (as in the cases of Job and David), or his weakened loyalty to the will of God as an agent afterwards (as with Saul), his attachment to God and serviceableness as an agent of His purposes (as with Abraham or Joseph), or his detachment and rejection as unserviceable (as Saul or Judas). And this interpretation of temptation and its issue dictates the presentation of it as a whole. As belonging to the make of man, and as the divinely ordered method of progress towards tried virtue it is regarded as the will and act of God, as a perfect means to a good end; and we are called on to welcome it, to count it all joy when we fall into manifold temptations. Such probation produces 'patience,' and leads to our being 'perfect and entire, lacking in nothing.' So treated, temptation becomes actually one of the good gifts and perfect boons bestowed by the Creator who is Himself unchangeably good. The Lord Himself was made perfect so, and we now reap the blessing of the discipline through which

He passed. Thus we may with an almost fierce exultation and humble hope enter into temptation. God proves to bless and to use; and temptation is not beyond human power of endurance supported by grace. On the other hand, as involving facing the dread will opposed to God and as possibly

ending in a falling away to it, it is perilous and awful. We are taught to pray that it may not prove our master: *Bring us not unto temptation as unto a snare from which we do not escape* (cf. 1 Co 10<sup>13</sup>), *but deliver us from the evil one*.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> H. J. C. Knight, *The Temptation of our Lord*.

## The Angel of God, or God the King?

BY THE REVEREND T. NICKLIN, M.A., WARDEN, HULME HALL, MANCHESTER.

It is a commonplace to-day that, at one stage in the development of the Hebrew Revelation, the title 'Baal' was, without hesitation or offence, applied to Yahweh, while in later days the title became restricted to certain heathen deities, and the traces of the earlier Hebrew use were covered over by such means as substituting 'Bosheth' (abomination, idol) for Baal.

Some time back, it occurred to me to inquire whether, in a similar way, at one stage in the Hebrew development Melech (=King) did not come into use as a variant or synonym for Yahweh, and whether traces of this use might still survive, concealed in the Sacred Scriptures by replacing it with Malach (=Messenger, Angel). The late Principal W. H. Bennett, to whom I communicated the idea two or three months before his death, encouraged me to prosecute the search, and it is the results of this investigation which are here presented for consideration and criticism.

### I.

The conception of Yahweh as a King, the King of His people, was certainly familiar to Hebrew Psalmists or Prophets. 'The Lord is King' is the beginning of three Psalms, and the same phrase occurs twice elsewhere. Besides this, the identification of God with the King of heaven, of all the earth, and of the Psalmist is found some score of times in the Psalms. The second Isaiah speaks of Yahweh as the King of Israel (44<sup>6</sup>), and Zephaniah has the same title (3<sup>15</sup>). Isaiah, in the famous vision at the time of his call, says that his 'eyes have seen the King, the Lord of hosts' (6<sup>5</sup>). It is unnecessary to multiply instances. No one will be unaware that 'King' is constantly used by way

of apposition. The question, which needs further investigation, is whether in narrative 'the King' was ever used by itself as a title for Yahweh.

It is notorious that the title was used by other nations, e.g. the Ammonites. It will be noticed that the Rabbinic tradition has given to the name the vowels of Bosheth, so that for Melech they read Molech when it is a heathen god.

### II.

Are there any traces still remaining of a non-heathen use of the title Melech for Yahweh, expunged by later readers because of the heathen associations of the name? Many readers still remember the somewhat puzzling, or at any rate curious, way in which the story of Gideon's call is narrated, so that now the Lord and now His angel is represented as speaking to him. We have only to consider the following skeleton of vv. 12-20 in Jg 6 to feel the force of the suggestion that for 'the angel of the Lord' the original text was '*the Lord the King*': 'and the angel of the Lord appeared unto him . . . and the Lord looked upon him, and said . . . and he said unto him . . . and the Lord said unto him . . . and he said unto him . . . Depart not hence I pray thee, until I come unto thee . . . and he said, I will tarry until thou come again, . . . and the angel of God said unto him . . .'

In Gn 48<sup>15, 16</sup> we have, 'The God before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac did walk, the God which hath fed me all my life long unto this day, the angel which hath redeemed me from all evil.' Here it is natural to suspect the true reading to be 'the King.'

In Ec 5<sup>1, 2, 6</sup>, if the Authorized Version and



the Revisers' text were accepted, we shall have 'Keep thy foot when thou goest to the house of God. . . . Be not rash with thy mouth, and let not thy heart be hasty to utter anything before God . . . for God is in heaven, and thou upon earth. . . . Suffer not thy mouth to cause thy flesh to sin, neither say thou before the angel that it was an error, . . . wherefore God should be angry at thy voice.' Here it would be natural to read 'the King,' but there is little doubt that the marginal rendering of the Revisers is correct, and that the priest is God's messenger, as in Mal 2<sup>7</sup>. As will be seen later, this is consonant with the generally accepted dating of Koheleth and with the evidence here presented of the title Melech.

In Hos 12<sup>3, 4, 5</sup>, we have of Jacob: 'In his manhood he had power with God: yea, he had power over the angel and prevailed: he wept and made supplication unto Him: he found Him at Bethel . . . even the Lord, the God of hosts.' Again, why not 'the King'?

In Gn 21<sup>17</sup>, 'God heard the voice of the lad . . . and the angel of God called to Hagar out of heaven.' It is at least worth considering whether the original text was 'and God the King called.' So too in 31<sup>11</sup>, where we read, 'The angel of God said unto him. . . . I am the God of Bethel.'

We may now content ourselves with quoting other passages:

Gn 16<sup>7, 9, 10, 11, 13</sup>, 'The angel of the Lord said unto her, . . . she called the name of the Lord that spake unto her. . . .'

Jg 13<sup>3, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22</sup>, 'The angel of God came. . . . The angel of the Lord said, . . . Manoah said unto his wife, We shall surely die, because we have seen God.'

Ex 3<sup>2, 4</sup>, 'The angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a flame of fire. . . . God called unto him out of the midst of the bush.'

In all these passages, the present text as it stands goes to corroborate the suggestion we are considering, that at one period in the Hebrew history Melech was an orthodox title for Yahweh. There are numerous other passages in which, if we were to accept the soundness of this suggestion, it is natural to surmise that under our present Biblical text there is lying an older text, more or less altered and refined by the substitution of Angel for King, but it does not seem to be worth

while to set out with the intention of reconstructing the hypothetical original.

One celebrated verse in the Psalms may, however, be mentioned. In 8<sup>5</sup>, the LXX and Syriac have 'Thou hast made him but little lower than the angels,' where the Hebrew rightly translated says 'God.' It may be suggested that angels is not a wrong translation of *Elohim*, but that anciently the Hebrew contained the word Melech.

A curiously interesting parallelism is to be found in 2 S 24<sup>20</sup>, 'And Araunah looked forth and saw the king and his servants coming on toward him: and Araunah went out, and bowed himself before the king with his face to the ground'; and 1 Ch 21<sup>20, 21</sup>, 'And Ornan turned back, and saw the angel; and his four sons that were with him hid themselves. . . . Ornan looked and saw David . . . and bowed himself to David with his face to the ground.' Here we seem to get the Chronicler reading the authority on which he is working as if he had spoken of 'Angel' instead of 'King.'

### III.

It will be noticed that the books in which, without alteration of the text, there is symptom of an original 'King' instead of the present 'Angel,' are those which analytic criticism has declared to be built upon earlier works than the Priestly books subsequently intermingled with them. This consideration points to the probability, if not the certainty, that we owe it to the Scribes of the Captivity that the title Melech has been worked over and eliminated. The rarity of the title in the Prophets suggests further that they had discouraged its use. This is what we might have expected, and is analogous to what we know of the employment of the title 'Baal.' It is interesting to observe that the Psalms in which the title 'King' is applied to God are not to be found in those strata of the Psalter which scholars have classified as belonging to the latest collections. It is fair to infer, therefore, that in books written or revised during or after the Captivity, and, perhaps we might say, from the time of Uzziah, 'the angel of God' is the original expression used by the writer. There is no question in those later writings of any old title 'Melech' for God. As was pointed out above, this consideration helps to determine the right translation in the passage quoted from Ecclesiastes.

## Entre Nous.

### THREE TEXTS.

1 Tim. vi. 7.

We must learn yet to estimate men by the fortune they take with them, not by the fortune they leave behind.<sup>1</sup>

2 Tim. i. 12.

The instance that the scientific man prizes most highly is that which places his hypothesis under the severest test: no instance can either prove or disprove, either effectively expose falsity or ratify truth, except the instance he calls 'crucial.' It is the crucial instance also that expands the application and deepens the significance of the hypothesis. And the same results follow in regard to religious faith. The words 'I know Whom I have believed,' when they are uttered by one who has walked hand in hand with his own pettiness and ill-doing, carry a strange convincing and relieving power.<sup>2</sup>

1 Thess. v. 21.

'Hold fast that which is good.' Lucas could not respect that which he did not prove. I think that is all. 'Prove *all* things, ALL THINGS. Hold fast that which is *good*.' He quoted the little poem about 'Audrey' so often that I at last copied it down and here it is:

Audrey knoweth naught of books,  
Naught to captivate the wise,  
But the soul of goodness looks  
Through the quiet of her eyes.  
She can bake and she can knit,  
Cunningly she yields the broom,  
All her pleasure is to sit  
In a neatly ordered room.

Touchstone shaping a career  
Shines at each exclusive house:  
'Such a clever man, n.y. dear,  
Tied to just a country mouse.  
Married ere he dreamed of us,  
Ere he knew what gifts we had,  
Strange that fate should yoke him thus  
And very, very, very sad.'

<sup>1</sup> Sir Henry Jones, *A Faith that Enquires*, II.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* 12.

Touchstone, let them mark it well,  
When the social round is trod;  
Tired of dame and demoiselle,  
Goes home softly, praising God.

I think it must have been published in the *Spectator*, and it pleased Lucas by its simplicity.<sup>3</sup>

### SOME TOPICS.

#### The Feeding of the Five Thousand.

It is one of the most agreeable exercises of the unbeliever in miracle to explain the Feeding of the Five Thousand as a natural occurrence. The ways are many, and you cannot call one of them more incredible than another. The latest is Mr. Vivian MacMunn's:

'It used to be the fashion with rationalizing critics to explain the feedings of the four or five thousand by saying that our Lord had induced the disciples to share their provisions with fifty or a hundred outsiders. By the disciples the rationalists meant the twelve. Nothing could be flatter or more futile than the explanation as it was proposed; but if for the twelve we substitute the whole body of the Galilean followers, several hundreds in number, and by the multitudes we understand the crowds of pilgrims flocking to the great Healer from all parts of the land; and if we then go on to picture our Lord insisting that the first group should allow the second a share in the food provided for the common meals, we can see how the number of persons fed, though not miraculously, from time to time might amount in the aggregate to many thousands, and we can account for the tradition of the feeding as the crystallization of a practice into an episode.'

#### A Coincidence.

Undoubtedly one must allow for coincidences. This is a world in which queer things are wont to happen, in which remarkable coincidences occur. May I refer, by way of illustration, to an incident which recently came to my knowledge in this exceedingly, one is tempted to say excessively, regular portion of the universe? A young man calling one evening upon friends found them in

<sup>3</sup> *George Lloyd Hodgkin*, 198.



much perturbation over the loss of a ticket to the Cambridge symphony concerts. It had been lent them by a neighbour for a single performance and must be returned promptly for the owner's use at the next concert, but it could not be found. Jokingly, the young man said, 'I'll tell you where it is, it's in the programme which you brought home from the last concert.' 'But,' was the reply, 'we don't know where that is, either.' 'Why,' said the visitor, 'it has fallen down behind the table in your front entry.' A member of the family ran into the front hall and returned in a moment with the programme in her hand. 'Well,' she said to the young man, 'you were right about that, the programme was where you said we should find it, but since you are so wise where in the programme is the ticket?' 'Opposite page six,' was the confident reply. The pamphlet was opened at once, and sure enough opposite the very page which he had designated the long sought ticket was found. Now the young man was not at the concert, had not visited the house for several weeks, did not see the programme behind the hall table when he entered, and as for the number of the page, that was a pure guess. Barring a general familiarity with the ways of concert goers, such as putting a ticket in a programme, throwing the latter upon a hall table on entering the house, etc., the whole business was sheer coincidence—but it would have made the reputation of a medium! It is beyond question that such coincidences have played a rôle in more serious situations and we must allow for them, but even so not all the well authenticated facts seem explicable in this way.<sup>1</sup>

#### The Ideal.

'Though the ideal is not the deed, the deed that is not first an ideal known and valued and chosen cannot have any spiritual worth.'<sup>2</sup>

#### The Beyond.

'There seems to be in every least fact a baffling "beyond"; although, in truth, the "beyond" means *room to press forward*, and is an invitation to come still nearer the fact.'<sup>3</sup>

#### Religion and Life.

'I must confess that religion loses its value for

me if its presence and power are not made good everywhere in man's daily behaviour, in the social powers which play within him and around him, and even in the natural world which is also bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh. It must not merely be present, as one thing amongst many: it must be their truest meaning and highest worth. This religious faith, or view, or hypothesis, is, I believe, that in the light of which alone the universe is left a cosmos and not a chaos, and man's life therein a growing splendour and not a farce too tragical for tears.'<sup>4</sup>

#### Spiritualism.

'One might easily prefer to become extinct than to live on as an immortal fool.'<sup>5</sup>

#### Communion with God.

'When religious men speak of communion with God as of the familiar intercourse of friend with friend, of son with father, and plead the incredibility that such intercourse can be terminated by death, I would not for a moment question their testimony or controvert their argument; only to such an experience as they relate I, personally, am still a stranger.'<sup>6</sup>

#### Death's Die-ableness.

'All along father has been showing us the live-ableness of life; now he is showing us the die-ableness of death.'<sup>7</sup>

#### An Old English Marriage Benediction.

'The God of Heaven so join you now that you may rejoice and be glad of one another all your life; and when He who doth now join you shall separate you again, may He stablish you with the assurance that He hath but borrowed one of you for a time to make both more perfect in the life everlasting.'<sup>8</sup>

#### The Little Things.

'Someone said here last week: "It is the little things that take the most courage." I wonder if I agree?'<sup>9</sup>

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* 41.

<sup>5</sup> W. W. Fenn, *Immortality and Theism*, p. 17.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* 33.

<sup>7</sup> George Lloyd Hodgkin, 43.

<sup>8</sup> Quoted in *ibid.* 44.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* 131.

<sup>1</sup> W. W. Fenn, *Immortality and Theism*, p. 9.

<sup>2</sup> Sir Henry Jones, *A Faith that Enquires*, 14.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* 17.



**For Doubts.**

This is from John Allen's Diary, date Feb. 7, 1830—"After Chapel [in Cambridge—they were undergraduates together] Thackeray came up. He expressed some doubts of Christ being God; we read over St. Matthew together, and he was convinced. Went to bed very late, but I hope the day was not spent in vain."<sup>1</sup>

**The Chief of Sinners.**

Why did not Jesus call Himself the chief of sinners? The saint always does. John Allen of Cambridge was the wonder of his friends for uprightness of life, yet he enters in his Diary: "Determined by God's help to reform my life. "O my God, cure me of my extreme indolence. Teach me to know myself; cure my vanity." Surely there never was one so wicked as I."<sup>2</sup>

**A Sturdy Beggar.**

"One nobleman had promised a subscription towards the building of a church, but when the time came for its payment the money was not forthcoming. The Archdeacon wrote for it; receiving no reply, he wrote again and again with no effect. He then called, and, after being kept waiting, was admitted to an interview. On the man's refusing to pay his subscription, Allen said, "As I hold your promise, I shall put your lordship into the county court." A cheque for the amount was then written. The Archdeacon took it, and, saying solemnly, "God loves a cheerful giver. He has no regard for offerings extorted by fear," tore it up, threw it into the fire, left the room and went from the house. The money was afterwards sent to him with an apology and was then gratefully accepted."<sup>3</sup>

**Speaking Good.**

Lord Grimthorpe was a frequent visitor at Prees, Archdeacon Allen's country parish. He writes: "Allen was very good company when I was walking with him among his cottages and in his house. He was a lover and sayer of humorous things, which owed some of their force to his peculiar voice between a laugh and a lamentation. While we were walking I once asked him, "What does that young Hill do?" He stopped and struck his

stick on the ground as his manner was, and said, "Well, he kills rats."<sup>4</sup>

**Vergilian Mottoes.**

In his *Sortes Vergilianae* Professor Slater quotes some of the mottoes of great schools and great institutions which have been found in Vergil's half-lines—"those tiny "jets" of incomparable speech in which, ever and anon, he gives utterance to the great thoughts, the "eternal verities" with which we tend to associate his work." "Apart from the "Lest we forget" of Liverpool's "Deus nobis haec otia fecit," there is the motto of Harrow, "Stet Fortuna Domus!" The prosperity of the House—may it always be our bulwark! The motto of the Clan Macmillan, "Miseris succurrere disco," My task—the succour of the oppressed. The motto of the old Bath College, "Possunt, quia posse videntur," They can,—because they think they can. The motto of Clifton College, Earl Haig's old school—"Spiritus intus alit," "the soul of the place—the life-blood of us all." The creative word—the master phrase—the soul of a community."<sup>5</sup>

**NEW POETRY.****Katherine Moher.**

There are many war poems in *Remembering*, by Katherine Moher (Blackwell; 2s. 6d. net). And it is mostly the bitterness of loss, the mother's loss; for there is little hope of reunion.

**THE QUESTION.**

Is there no life beyond this golden air,  
No light beyond this shine on flower and tree;  
And is earth's beauty but a phantasy  
Woven by men to keep them from despair?  
As ivy hides impenetrable stone  
We hide with dreams our walls, and vainly trust  
That a transcendence gilds our mortal dust,  
That songs transcendent rise beyond our moan.  
We close our eyes with dreams, and fondly feign  
A gate through Beauty to Eternity;  
O piteous dream, our mortal walls stand fast,  
The mirage of Eternity is vain,  
The phosphorescence of mortality  
Our only light, and truth, and end at last.

Does that satisfy? Apparently not.

<sup>1</sup> John Allen and his Friends, 3.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. 6.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. 137.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. 203.

<sup>5</sup> P. 8.



## TIME AND SPACE.

What do I ask of time?

One magic hour to roam

In the pale splendour not of Earth

Where dreams are all at home.

What do I ask of space?

A druid solitude—

The slow flow of a dreaming stream

Deep in a haunted wood.

What do I ask of life?

O hear thy captive's plea

One window—open to the East

That dreams may come to me.

What do I ask of Death?

Death who has all to give—

My dreams—transformed to energies

Wherein my soul may live.

## John Bolus.

It is the rarest of achievements for a poet to be at once poetical and scientific. This combined art of Mr. Bolus's *Shires and Spires* (Grant Richards; 3s. 6d.) is up to date scientifically, that is to say, psychologically, and yet it is true art both in form and in substance.

## POSSIBILITIES.

As one who perilously o'er the brink

Of highest precipice looks down afraid

To depth on depth, where vision seems to fade

And lose itself, and instinct bids him shrink

From death's dark offer, lest he come to think

The call too forceful to be disobeyed,

Lest resolution fail of wonted aid,

And reason at the fount of madness drink;

E'en thus an everyday philosopher,

Probing the deeper chasms of his mind,

Discovers unimagined powers astir,

Amidst a territory undefined:

Faint growths, untaught to ripen earlier

Than in the eternity which lurks behind.

It is with his sonnets that Mr. Bolus is most successful. There is an equally poetical and more religious sonnet on the famous picture 'The Light of the World.'

## C. D. Locock.

*Thirty-two Passages from the Iliad* have been rendered in English rhymed verse by C. D. Locock (Allen & Unwin; 4s. 6d. net). It is a Homeric Anthology, and must be so encouraged that the *Odyssey* shall follow. What example may we offer? This is the arming of Achilles—at least that part which describes the armour. Has any one suggested that St. Paul had read it?

So the great gifts formed by the tireless art  
Of the lame God he took; and first around  
His legs the greaves of pliant tin he bound,  
Fitted with silver ankle-plates, and hung  
Upon his breast the breastplate. Next he slung  
Around his giant shoulders the great blade  
Studded with gleaming silver. Thus arrayed  
He took Hephæstus' glorious shield, and bright  
The far-flung radiance from that orb of light  
Shone like the moon's. And as when o'er the  
sea

The fisherman, bore on unwillingly  
By stormy winds, far from his home, descries  
The watch-fire burning on the hill where lies  
Some lonely farm,—so to the high heaven  
shone

Achilles' graven shield. Last he set on  
The crested helmet with the fine-wrought hair  
Woven by Hephæstus of pure gold; and fair,  
Even as a star, it gleamed about the crest,  
Fluttering i' the wind. Then he essayed to test  
The fitting of the armour, for he deemed  
His limbs might be impeded; but it seemed  
As wings to him, and lightly bore along  
The Shepherd of the people. Last the strong  
Great lance of Peleus, that no man on earth  
Save he alone might brandish, he drew forth  
From out its socket—the famed ashen spear  
By Cheiron given to his father dear,  
Grown on some Pelian mountain-top to be  
The death of many warriors.

## Tukaram.

How little done, how much to do! Was that what Rhodes said? How little learnt, how much to learn! That is what every one says who touches the religion of India. Here is a large handsome volume on Tukaram alone. And you say, who was Tukaram? Besides, there is the wealth of thought, suggestive fructive thought in Tukaram; and the wealth of real religious life. How overwhelming it is as new matter for memory, but how wonderful it is as revelation of God. The authors of this book on *The Life and Teaching of Tukaram* (Madras Christian Literature Society for India) are Mr. J. Nelson Fraser, M.A., formerly of the Indian Education Department, and Mr. J. F. Edwards, who wrote the article on Tukaram for the *ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS*.

Upon Tukaram's philosophy of life or his religious experience it is impossible even to enter. We must rest satisfied with the quotation of one of his hymns:

WITHIN MY HEART.<sup>1</sup>

I know no way by which  
My faith thy feet can reach  
Nor e'er depart.  
How, how can I attain  
That thou, O Lord, shalt reign  
Within my heart?

Lord, I beseech thee, hear  
And grant to faith sincere,  
My heart within,  
Thy gracious face to see,  
Driving afar from me  
Deceit and sin.

<sup>1</sup> Translated from Tukaram, *P.M.S.*, p. 62.

O come, I, Tukā, pray,  
And ever with me stay,  
Mine, mine to be.  
Thy mighty hand outstretch  
And save a fallen wretch,  
Yea, even me.

## Mary E. Boyle.

*Daisies and Apple Trees* is the title (Stirling: Mackay; 2s. 6d.).

The little book is illustrated by Mildred R. Lamb. And the problem is, whether is better, the poetry or the pictures? We cannot show the pictures. But we can sample the poetry.

## MUMMY'S ROOM.

Oh! Mummy's room smells lovely sweet,  
A refuge sort of place,  
Peep into cupboards for a treat  
You'll find clothes trimmed with lace.

When Daddy is away at sea,  
We each take turns to sleep  
In mummy's room, at early tea  
Into her bed we creep.

It's very safe in Mummy's room.  
She lets us hold her hands  
When we see monsters in the gloom  
'Cos Mummy understands.

---

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works,  
and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street,  
Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.